



Durham E-Theses

Co-operative teaching practice supervision : an analysis of how teachers, students teachers and supervising tutors may work together effectively.

Proctor, Kathleen Anne

How to cite:

Proctor, Kathleen Anne (1991) *Co-operative teaching practice supervision : an analysis of how teachers, students teachers and supervising tutors may work together effectively.*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1485/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP
e-mail: e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

CO-OPERATIVE TEACHING PRACTICE SUPERVISION:
AN ANALYSIS OF HOW TEACHERS, STUDENTS TEACHERS
AND SUPERVISING TUTORS MAY WORK TOGETHER
EFFECTIVELY

VOLUME 2

Kathleen Anne Proctor

A thesis, in two volumes, submitted to the School
of Education at the University of Durham
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1991

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.



Table of Contents

TITLE PAGE.....	352
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	353
APPENDIX 1: A MORE DETAILED ACCOUNT OF THE RESULTS OF THE FIRST STUDY.....	354
APPENDIX 2: A SUMMARY OF GUIDELINES TO AID CO-OPERATION.....	357
APPENDIX 3: A SKILL LIST.....	360
APPENDIX 4: A MORE DETAILED ACCOUNT OF THE RESULTS OF THE SECOND STUDY.....	363
APPENDIX 5: THE EXPERIENCE OF THE PARTICIPATING TUTORS IN THE THIRD STUDY.....	378
APPENDIX 6: A COPY OF THE INFORMATION GIVEN TO THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE THIRD STUDY.....	380
APPENDIX 7: QUESTIONS DIRECTING THE COLLECTION OF DATA IN THE THIRD STUDY.....	385
APPENDIX 8: PROGRAMME OF THE RESEARCH.....	392
APPENDIX 9: SHEETS USED TO ORGANISE THE DATA IN ORDER TO COMPARE THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE PARTICIPANTS.....	394
APPENDIX 10: SOME EXTRACTS FROM TUTORS' TEACHING PRACTICE NOTES WRITTEN FOR THE STUDENTS.....	396
APPENDIX 11: CASE-STUDIES.....	404



saying everything was great, there's no problem....life was very pleasant (i.e. in the eyes of T) but it wasn't."

Classification A collaborator relationship, functioning at a superficial level, which tended to exclude the influence of the tutor.

A more detailed account of the results of the first study

The difficulties of communication were discussed openly among the participants and a commitment was made to try and overcome them.

Initially the investigator tried to gain the confidence of the teachers by teaching their classes as well as by spending a lot of time talking to them. This need to be seen as a "real" teacher has already been suggested by Rust (1988). Despite all these arrangements to enhance co-operation, there was still the potential for some of the problems of communication referred to in chapter 2.

- If the investigator went into school and the teacher was teaching another class or working in the school library (while the student teacher was teaching the class) an interview did not take place because the tutor did not want to "impose" herself and take up the teacher's "valuable time"
- The teachers were sometimes "afraid to impose" their viewpoints on the tutor whom they were afraid might not agree with them about priorities
- Even when meetings were regularly arranged there were sometimes awkward silences - the tutor trying very hard not to impose herself on the situation and the teachers very anxious to be helpful but not knowing what the tutor "wanted".

In fact, in the experience of all the participants and despite the care taken to develop a co-operative relationship in each school, it was quite difficult to develop any professional dialogue about teaching. This finding, i.e. that teachers do not find it easy to discuss their common-sense knowledge, was very much in line with the difficulties encountered by other researchers in similar situations (see Chapter 2).

Responding to difficulties "in situ" is typical of the action research approach and the response made here was to invite all the teachers to keep diaries of points which they made to the students in between the tutor's visits. These diaries came to provide a more satisfactory basis for the professional discussion about teaching.

However, related to this problem was the equally serious difficulty which was anticipated from a review of the literature, of defining the particular responsibilities of each participant. The tutor and one teacher will remember very well the ridiculous situation when they spent some considerable time politely discussing who should suggest to the student that a classroom display would enhance her project work!

Other problems were associated with the relationships

between the students and the teachers:

- When should the teacher remain in the class and when should the student be left on her own?
- How critical should the teacher be of the student's performance?
- How much should the student request help from the teacher and how much help should be given?

These are problems which had been anticipated.

Relationships were affected by other circumstances, some expected, others less so:

- One thing which should have been very obvious but often is not really considered is that the student and the teacher actually have very little talking time in a primary classroom since when one is free the other is almost certainly teaching
- In general terms some teachers were mistrustful of the "ambitious" ideas which students had and of the level of practical preparation which they believed students received in college.

It became clear that these relationships were very important and very difficult to manipulate. It was comparatively easy to define the conditions under which the easy, comfortable relationships or the tension loaded relationships develop but very difficult to bring those conditions about.

APPENDIX 2

A SUMMARY OF GUIDELINES TO AID CO-OPERATION

A Summary of guidelines to aid co-operation

1. Make an agreement with supervising tutor about when to speak together.
2. Set out to bring up matters with supervising tutor.
3. Make certain agreements with student about watching which satisfy both of you.
4. Try to work out a plan of what to look for (see list).
5. Develop a working relationship with the student.
This is something which each "pair" develops for themselves but below is a summary of some of the things which you mentioned when we discussed the matter in school.

- (a) About plans: What are you going to do tomorrow? Why? Would that make it more effective? etc. etc.

We suggested that it would be unwise to make a lot of suggestions just before the student was going to teach, if s/he were likely to see the suggestions as criticisms and lose confidence.

- (b) Feedback: We suggested that this was essential because no feedback was often taken as criticism. Of course, it has to be dealt with sensitively eg. How did it go? Were you happy with it?

- leading on to

Why did you do that? How did such-a-body behave? What worried you? Would that have been better?

It was suggested that questions should be raised very carefully to encourage the students' own comments on and understanding of what went on during the lesson.

- (c) Talk about the children's work and comment on display or use of various aids.
- (d) As a result of discussion perhaps work out what is good and what needs special attention.
- (e) It was suggested that students sometimes have very original ideas but need quite a lot of help in translating them into practice.
6. Perhaps arrange a teaching session each week so that the student can watch and review.
 7. We discussed the possibility of a student/teacher discussion time while I teach the class.
 8. Diary

The idea of this is to keep some record of those aspects of teaching which arise out of your work with the student: it is likely to include small matters that crop up from day to day. You may also mention what you come to think of as the best way to work with the student and any problems which might arise e.g. time to talk; how to criticise etc.

Some teachers like to write a very short daily summary but others prefer to jot down problems or points of interest as they arise.

You will probably mention things which go well and things which you see as problems.

You may wish to discuss the diary with your student but as far as I am concerned it will be read only by me and will not be discussed with anyone without your permission.

APPENDIX 3

A SKILL LIST

A skill list

Preparation

1. Having ideas
2. Producing materials - adequate/good resources
3. Having everything available in good time
4. Evidence of thinking through a topic i.e. seeing how the parts fit with one another; anticipating some of the problems of implementation
5. Having enough understanding of how the class is usually managed to be able, at least at first, to maintain the system.

Teaching

1. Enough "suitable" material pitched at "about the right" level
2. Putting ideas into practice
 - > adaptation of ideas i.e. an increasing skill in implementing ideas, especially adapting them for individuals and in new situations
3. Explanation, e.g. an understanding of the steps you are going to take, the order in which they will come and the language to be used
 - > development of more adequate explanation and a repertoire of techniques (e.g. repetition of instructions in a different form; showing a finished article before asking children to tackle something similar)
4. Appropriate directions (see also control/management)
5. Timing (i) appropriate timing for the work session, e.g. discussion > activity > feedback
 - (ii) knowing how long to allow a piece of work to go on or "not dragging a topic on too long"
6. Sequencing, e.g. heavy > light
 - simple > complex
 - known > unknown
7. Stop > think > change task
8. Increasing response to individual children
 - (i) awareness of what sorts of tasks individuals can perform
 - (ii) appropriate provision for individuals, e.g. type of task and presentation of task
 - (iii) getting appropriate amount and level of work from individual children
 - (iv) reading and commenting on children's work with sympathy and intelligence
9. "Catching" and following up children's enthusiasm
10. Encouraging children's self-initiated activity
11. Progressive development in particular curriculum areas, specify

Control/management/relationships

1. Speaking to the class
2. Awareness of class routines
3. Organisation: who? does what? where?
 - > more complex organisation e.g. development of class routines to make for ease of management and children's autonomy
 - "how to do several things at the same time"
4. Simple question/answer session
5. Doing things rather than allowing them to happen
6. Timing:, e.g. how long it takes to tidy up or get ready for PE etc.
7. Filling in gaps
8. Direction: (i) giving appropriate directions
 - (ii) control, either implicit or explicit, of what an individual is doing at any particular time- this includes awareness of children's behaviour and activities
9. Getting the children to be self-reliant
10. Anticipating problems
11. Repetition of instructions in different forms
12. Appropriate response to individual awkward children
13. Presentation of children's work
14. Interaction:
 - (i) getting the children on your side
 - (ii) giving praise appropriately
 - (iii) involving children in discussion
 - (iv) speaking to children appropriately, e.g. in a way that shows you have respect for them;
"getting things done without a fuss"
 - (v) listening to what children have to say

Personal

1. Use of voice
2. Establishing presence
3. Asserting yourself
4. Coming to terms with your own reactions to children;
e.g. "not getting rattled", "not letting them get under your skin"
5. Listening and responding to advice including developing a reaction to criticism
6. Fitting in with and contributing to school life
7. Developing your own style or using your own personality to the best advantage (i.e. "finding your own best way")

APPENDIX 4

A MORE DETAILED ACCOUNT OF THE RESULTS OF THE SECOND STUDY

A more detailed account of the results of the second study

1. Evaluating co-operation during the second study

There is no doubt about the satisfaction which most of the participants derived from taking part in the project. This was evident from their willingness to take part, their welcome to the investigator, their enthusiasm to offer points of view and opinions. What was most apparent was their pleased surprise that supervision and teaching practice were being recognised as important enough to study (notably the teachers point of view), and the opportunity afforded to see what other people did (notably the tutors' point of view).

Different aspects of the co-operation are considered below:

Teacher/student interaction

As a result of the earlier study certain steps were taken to encourage interaction between the student teachers and the teachers, based on the guidelines for co-operation. Certain general points arose out of monitoring this interaction:

(1) Although different sorts of working partnerships were developed in every case, the relationships between teachers and student teachers were very good indeed.

(2) Because of the matching of teaching commitments of teachers and students it was anticipated that the availability of the teachers for discussion might be a problem. This varied from group to group. Teachers made time first thing in the morning, breaktime, dinner-time, after school and sometimes during school assembly. A number of teachers reported that they had willingly given extra time. Some teachers had other school commitments which took up their time, e.g. as deputy head, replacement for absentees, as well as special commitments taken on because they had a student e.g. curriculum planning, library work. It was quite easy to see a development in availability during the practice, i.e. in the early stages the teacher was readily available to the student teacher and if/when the student teacher became more confident the teacher often became more committed to other things. This was a most natural development but it could work to the disadvantage of the student. One or two who, as their confidence increased, wanted to try out new ideas would have welcomed the chance to discuss these in more depth at that same moment when their teacher had become more heavily committed. It was also clear that, although every teacher made her/himself available to the students on request, at times student teachers were reluctant to make demands on heavily committed teachers.

Students teachers also had a part to play in making themselves available, e.g. student teachers who asked

questions, made requests, spent time in the staffroom and generally involved themselves in the life of the school, got more feedback and information than those who did not. This aspect of the personal differences between student teachers was in line with the findings of other people working in this area.

(3) The issue of formality/informality in planning interaction between the pairs, raised some different viewpoints. A number of teachers began with a comparatively formal time arrangement to speak to the student, which became informal during the practice. There seems to be no great merit in formality as such, but this type of arrangement did have some advantages, e.g. some student teachers reported that, initially, they did not know how to make best use of the discussion session with the teacher, because they "didn't know what to ask", but later when the teacher had discontinued the sessions the student teacher would have welcomed the time. Also students reported being more willing to make requests of the teacher if it was their (i.e. the student teachers,) allocated time. Similarly, when the investigator released teachers and student teachers by taking the class, some of them reported a session which was useful because it had been set aside for the specific purpose of discussion. It could be argued that schools are very busy places where a number of things are competing for priority.

One group of student teachers found that informal discussion centred on the children. This they found very useful but there were times when these student teachers would have welcomed comment on their own teaching performance which was more likely to be part of formally arranged sessions.

The tendency of the teachers was to dislike formality which they seemed to associate with being critical of the student teacher and creating tension, although some teachers made trio meetings with the investigator an exception to this. The reluctance which teachers seem to feel about being critical has been recognised in other studies.

The different expressed opinions between one group of student teachers and their teachers was worth closer investigation. Some student teachers preferred informal discussion, not because formality produced tension but because it was easier to talk about problems as they arose. By the time the session arrived the problem was forgotten so they did not know what to talk about. The same difficulty was faced by the investigator in the first study.

(4) Another issue which arose out of the earlier study was the sensitivity of the student teachers to the teachers' presence in the classroom. This was an issue which was pointed out to the teachers in advance (see guidelines), when it was suggested that they made some specific

arrangements with their student teachers. In fact, no pairs made specific arrangements and only one teacher wondered afterwards whether she should have done. At the same time no student expressed dissatisfaction with his/her situation. All the teachers were very sensitive about the authority/confidence of the students. There were a variety of surveillance practices, e.g. teacher "hovers" in the resource area; teacher stays in for the start of the lesson, leaves, returns at intervals especially for tidying up; teacher sits as silently and as unobtrusively as possible in the classroom while the student teacher is teaching; teacher and student teacher team teach; teacher participates in the student teacher's lesson. The teacher discussions highlighted some of the school and class factors which influenced this practice. In some schools the teachers, after the first week, were timetabled with other classes. In some schools teachers were not expected to be in the staffroom or it was being used by other classes so that if they were not teaching elsewhere they had to be in the classroom with the student teacher. Schools were very different in their design, i.e. in shape/size of classrooms, provision of convenient resource areas etc. The teaching approach being used in the classroom had an important influence on whether extra adults could easily be accommodated. Some classes lent themselves to team teaching, in others the presence of an adult (especially one who was trying to get on with his or her own work) could be extremely distracting. Some teachers were aware that the children would turn to them for help if they stayed in the class with the student teacher.

Team-teaching itself could be used effectively in different ways. In some classes the student had sole responsibility for the majority of the class in her own area of the classroom. In these instances the responsibility and authority of student and teacher were clearly defined. In other classes team teaching went on only in specific areas of the curriculum (e.g. Maths). In other classes the students had responsibility but the teachers joined in if and when necessary. In one instance in particular this worked admirably with no lowering of the authority of the student. At certain times the roles were reversed. The interest here was to analyse the circumstances under which this effective co-operation can take place.

(5) The structure and organisation of the classroom was important for at least two reasons, first, how easy it was for the student teacher to take over, and, secondly, how much it was open to change. In considering the first question it was interesting to see the strategies which teachers could develop to help the student teacher in the initial stages. It was quite clear that some sorts of classroom organisation, while extremely effective, were very difficult for student teachers to take over. The problem for the teacher was whether to help the student teacher to take over the classroom organisation as it was or whether to simplify the organisation in the initial

stages. In this study different things happened. In two instances the teachers very successfully helped the student teachers to take over what, initially, seemed a very complicated system. In a further two instances the teachers recognised the discomfort of the student teachers with the system in existence and supported them in developing a different one. In a further class the student teacher eventually, with some difficulty and some adaptation, mastered a complex and effective system. Feedback from the student teachers suggested that they probably found it easier to master the system in operation and then adapt it, rather than building up their own system from the beginning. In other words, well-meaning teachers who assure students that they can "do what you like" can cause problems for student teachers. However, as has already been pointed out, some systems are too complicated for some student teachers to deal with or they are systems with which student teachers feel uncomfortable. In this case teachers can help in certain ways.

The second question was concerned with teachers' attitudes to change in their classrooms. There were a range of different attitudes expressed here, e.g. from "students don't need to work in the same way as you, you can't expect it" and "teachers have got to be prepared to see that there will be changes in a classroom with a student" to "I want my routine kept". Also it became apparent that teachers were different in the extent to which they could see that their aims may be achieved by different methods. Teachers who had spent long and difficult months establishing a system were very likely to be reluctant to see it disintegrate completely, and all teachers would feel pressure to maintain children's progress. Teachers were quite likely to feel resentment if they believed that a system was being arbitrarily imposed on them by the college, especially if it seemed to be for the purpose of "putting on a show" or "taking part in a performance". The general impression from this study was that teachers were prepared to accept change if they: had confidence in the student teacher; had confidence in the tutor; felt that the student teacher was receiving practical backup from the tutor; that the teacher could stop the process if it did not appear to be achieving its aims.

(6) As part of the research project the teachers were invited to keep a diary recording those aspects of teaching which arose out of their work with the student teacher (see guidelines). This was seen, originally, as a way in which the investigator could get information. It came to have more significance than had been expected. More than half of the student teachers and some of the teachers referred to the usefulness of the diary as a means of promoting discussion about the student teacher's teaching, rather than about the children's behaviour (see above). For example:

T: "That book you made us do - you do it and then go through it. The student might say I don't agree

with that but I could try that."

and S: "Yes, that's how the diary helped us because she'd actually use the diary - she'd have it there and say we've got to talk about how its gone today sort of thing, but without that the talk wouldn't have gone in that direction."

and S: "I found that as well, I found that sometimes the teacher would say right we've got to talk about this, so that I can write something in the diary."

Perhaps it should also be pointed out that, although every teacher was extremely co-operative and far too polite to make a single complaint, it was intimated that the keeping of a diary was sometimes seen as a tiresome duty imposed by an (irritating!) tutor.

Trios

(1) The physical arrangements in the school were likely to have an influence on interaction between teacher, student teacher and tutor, e.g. in a small open-plan school the tutor was more likely to come across the staff informally than in a large rambling school of traditional design. In the latter instance quite a lot of time could be spent walking up and down corridors looking for somebody to talk to.

(2) Related to the last point was the making of appointments. Most of the time the tutors went into school by previous arrangement, (since one of the main aims of the study was to encourage student teacher/teacher /tutor interaction this was one way of ensuring it). Generally speaking teachers and tutors preferred this system. They commented as follows:

T: "This way seems more systematic and shows a commitment on the part of the tutor."

S: "There are often disruptions in school and if fore-warned teachers and students can minimise problems on a particular day - this makes them feel a lot more comfortable and competent."

Tut: "Teachers often have other school commitments and it is much easier for them to be available to the tutor if they have set a time in advance."

If the teacher, student teacher and tutor needed to talk in a trio rather than in two lots of two then a previous arrangement was either essential or the tutor needed to know the school well enough to pick a convenient time. This was not to say that trios did not sometimes happen spontaneously (i.e. the three meeting together for a cup of tea at breaktime). However, the evidence from the discussions suggested that even these "spontaneous"

meetings only happened because the teacher knew when to expect the tutor. Some teachers expressed reservations about these arrangements because they felt that it could lead to anxiety on the part of the student about the visit, and her/his presenting a contrived display for the tutor. The apparent evidence was that this did not happen but still it is a reservation to be taken seriously.

(3) Important influences on the relationships were the expectations which teachers held about the "duties" of tutors. This was a very difficult area to consider because the teachers were: very different in their expectations; held their views with different amounts of conviction; had some expectations which were intuitive and not necessarily consistent with each other.

First, teachers had expectations about the amount of time tutors should spend in school, and generally speaking these expectations were not realised. Teachers believed that tutors needed time to understand the school situation, time to understand what was really happening in the class, time to help the student teacher plan. This was a common and insoluble problem but what was perhaps more interesting was the way the teachers judged the amount of time which the tutor put into the supervision of a student teacher. The actual amount of time the tutor spent in school was less important than how the time was spent, or to put it another way, the amount of time the tutor spent did not necessarily match the amount of time the teacher judged had been spent.

Secondly, the teachers wanted rules to govern their behaviour. During the discussions there came requests from some teachers for parameters of their responsibility. Implicit in these requests was the assumption that it was possible to define the rules in advance. However it was also a feature of the discussion that these "rules" depended upon the particular situation and the people involved. In some instances the rules were successfully negotiated over time, to meet specific circumstances.

Thirdly, the teachers had a concern about planning. This was a tricky area generating differences of opinion and differences in understanding of the meaning of the word planning. Most teachers saw the keeping of the file as a college-imposed task which should be supervised by tutors. A number of teachers reviewed the file and some were even interested in it. Teachers tended to see long term planning as the responsibility of college and to be supervised by tutors, but many teachers wanted much more opportunity to monitor the planning because they could recognise the suitability of material for the children and ensure continuity. This was potentially a difficult area because teachers believed the college wanted certain things, the tutors believed the teachers wanted certain things, and the student teachers were left wondering in the middle. There was great scope for co-operation here which would require time and confidence. On a daily basis some very good team

planning was observed with the student teacher generating ideas and the teacher offering information about resources and perhaps more importantly some very practical, specific advice about organisation and use of material. In a few instances team teaching produced some very effective co-operative planning and in others the teacher, recognising a weakness on the part of the student (or a strength of her/his own) actually initiated the planning. Again this seemed an area which could be exploited.

Finally teachers were concerned about evaluation: This could refer to both the teacher and/or the tutor evaluating the student teacher's performances, or the teacher and/or the tutor helping the student teacher to evaluate her/his own performances. Some teachers were very unhappy indeed about becoming involved in either of these activities and felt that this was definitely the province of the tutors. Others saw evaluation as such an important part of teaching that it was their "duty" to help the student teacher evaluate. It was less easy to find out how it was done. Generally speaking teachers were uncomfortable in the role of evaluating their students teachers' teaching both because they thought it was not their "job" and because it might be detrimental to their relationship with the student. This did not mean that they were never critical of students. Some of the teachers waited impatiently for tutors to recognise problems and act, others were able to discuss their fears with tutors and then leave the latter to act.

(4) The effectiveness of trios depended upon talk, so important tutor characteristics were "to be easy to talk to" and "good at getting talk going". One way of doing this was to have something to talk about; "to get involved" i.e. "to be able to join in with the work of the class". This was appreciated by student teachers because they did not like "being watched" and they felt that the children sometimes reacted badly to strangers. It was appreciated by teachers because it gave "common ground" for conversation. This was the case when the tutor took the class and when s/he became involved in what was going on, e.g.

S: "....Spent a lot of time with us and she was very open...she was talkative with teachers wasn't she.....none of us felt uneasy at all."

T: "If you've got a tutor who can set you off talking.....with some you don't get started."

(5) Good relationships were based on more than just "being able to talk", and a number of other important factors were identified. It takes time to build up trust and confidence and moving tutors from one school to a different one every teaching practice makes this very difficult. One of the best ways of gaining the confidence of the teachers and

student teachers was to be able to support advice by giving practical help and support in implementation, e.g.

S: "I felt I was being pushed into things I wasn't sure about, but it wasn't that, she didn't just say go on and do it.....she got to know the class and the problems and more or less helped me to teach them sometimes."

However, friendly and frank relations were also a basis for effective co-operation. Teachers respected tutors for their concern for the student teachers, their friendly attitude and approachability, and their openness about their own strengths and weaknesses.

Another important point which arose in this context was that student teachers can feel very vulnerable when they see tutors and teachers talking together.

S: "I used to get frustrated because I used to see my tutor and teacher talking and I never found out what they said."

This could be seen as more of a problem if the student teacher did not see tutor and teacher talking together regularly.

S: "I think they only spoke together twice in the practice...that's when they were worried about me ...so I felt great!"

The problem could be relieved by an enquiring student teacher.

S: "If I wanted to know what the tutor said to the teacher I had to ask..."

Sometimes members made a point of informing each other.

S: ".....And everything T and tutor said together T made a point of telling me....and I always told her what tutor said, because she didn't want me to feel left out so I did the same for her."

It was not possible, in research of this type, to establish a direct causal relationship between the use of the list of guidelines and the co-operation which undoubtedly went on in teacher/student teacher/tutor trios. Certainly the nature of the project encouraged the participants to expect there to be dialogue. What was important from the point of view of the piece of research was that dialogue could be established but that it required perseverance and determination to maintain it.

2. Evaluating the use of the skills list

It would be quite incorrect to assume that the existence of the skill sheet could provide the automatic answer to effective supervision and teacher/tutor discussion. The tutors, being the helpful co-operative people they were, tried to use it under pressure from the investigator. The latter also spent time in discussion with individual teachers to clarify the wording and relate the headings to teachers' specific practice. The discussions were very useful for a number of reasons.

First, it was a short cut to getting into dialogue with teachers about teaching. This seems a very simple statement but its importance should not be underestimated in the light of the difficulties experienced in the first study.

Secondly, using the sheet with teachers set up a discussion which gave, quite quickly, all sorts of information about practice in that particular classroom. It also helped the teacher to draw on her/his intuitive teaching knowledge which was potentially very helpful in advising student teachers, especially any having difficulties. Teachers work closely with student teachers and so have a lot of information about their teaching but they do not necessarily apply this information directly to the problems/interests of the students. It seemed that there was potential here for more sharing of information.

The general reaction of the teachers to the use of the skill list ranged from very positive to fairly neutral. The most negative reaction was the suggestion that the list should not become a theoretical document used in a practical situation, and this is in line with reported attitudes of teachers to theoretical approaches to teaching. The more positive remarks included such comments as:

T: "Actually we pick things out of your sheet to be honest. That's been a guide. I think tutors at college really do need a guide of what we are all looking for."

T: "...We've been saying we'll watch this particular aspect this week and its been a start."

T: "I must admit that check sheet has also helped me. Why do I do such and such a thing or why do I do it that way?"

T: (talking about the skills sheet as a basis for discussion)

"We do it instinctively anyway, but perhaps it puts into terms that you can go through later."

T: "Yes, we used that....well...that helps, it

made you think about what was going on."

T: "I think it had more use when you had a student who had difficulty....gave you guidelines on what was going wrong."

T: "I found that sheet useful because at one point when I'd made what suggestions I could and then I found I knew she was having problems, but I couldn't put my finger on what would make it better and that sheet did in fact help."

Some teachers found it more useful to use the sheet for their own benefit towards the end of the practice. They found that by going through some of the headings they were able to express more clearly the strengths and weaknesses of the student teacher, e.g. the teacher who said, "I wish I had gone through this with you before I wrote my report."

All the tutors attempted to use the sheet and in many ways their attitudes were similar to those of the teachers with whom they worked, i.e. giving names to intuitive ideas; giving common talking points; picking up the causes of weaknesses. Some tutors liked the discipline of focusing on particular aspects, for others this was restrictive. Giving the sheet to tutors in the discussion group certainly engendered valuable arguments about and clarification of teaching issues, in the same way that it had generated discussion with the teachers about classroom practice.

All the students were given a copy of the sheet but no particular instruction to make use of it, in order to avoid putting any extra pressure on them at a very busy time. For this reason they were not asked directly for opinions about it.

3. The nature of supervision

It was extremely difficult to access tutors' professional knowledge about supervision. They did not appear to have a systematic understanding of their own intentions in general terms or even for particular student teachers. There were several possible reasons for this: that they did not know what their intentions were; that they did not have any; that their intentions could not easily be accessed in these circumstances; that their intentions changed according to the precise nature of the situation at any one time and so could not be generalised.

There may have been elements of all of these but probably the third and fourth ones were significant. This suggested itself because it became clear that tutors could justify what they had done under particular circumstances and could explain in detail to each other the reasons behind a particular action which they had taken. It is hard to express the interest and excitement with which they listened to how their colleagues acted. Very often the

whole hour was taken up with eager questions and fascinated reactions. The isolation which surrounds the work of tutors was very plainly apparent.

One very clear outcome of the discussion was the way in which a tutor's behaviour was tailored to a specific situation. This was apparent when they described what they did but it was also apparent in their reaction to theoretical approaches to supervision introduced by the investigator, e.g. skill teaching might be useful but it was not necessary to teach a particular skill to a particular named student teacher because she was working with a competent teacher and would pick it up in context from her; it was quite inappropriate to use clinical supervision with another named student teacher because if you waited for her to raise issues you would wait all the practice and the class would be in uproar; however with a another student teacher that was the approach which was always adopted because the student was competent, analytical and prepared to enter into a professional dialogue.

Like the teachers, the tutors referred to influencing elements like size of class, nature of the children, discipline in the class, complexity of classroom organisation, nature of the school expectations (including approach to the curriculum), perceived skill and personality of the student teacher. All of these could exercise a significant influence on the judgement and subsequent behaviour of the tutor. Unlike the teachers, the tutors were not aware of all these aspects straight away and often "fumbled in the dark" or "wasted valuable time" because they could not get the information they needed quickly or, to put it another way they could not weigh up the situation quickly enough. Each of the factors referred to above influenced the tutors at different times but what was more important was how they interacted together in any one particular situation to produce a total picture of that situation in a specific classroom.

In describing the total picture in any one classroom the most significant factor was the relationship between the teacher and the student e.g.

(1) a complicated classroom organisation is a problem for a student teacher, and hence the supervisor, unless the teacher initiates the student teacher carefully into the system or simplifies it for the student teacher in the early stages

(2) "bouncy" children are less likely to be a problem for the student teacher (and the tutor) if the teacher is well in control and advises/helps or "protects" the student teacher.

(3) cramped conditions in a classroom are much less of a problem if teacher and student teacher are able to adapt to

each other

(4) excellent physical conditions are not an asset if the teacher is antagonistic.

Some quotations from the data illustrate the point:

- A tutor described her objectives after her first visit into school as:

"to establish the nature of the teacher/student relationship at this stage, and how far the essential dialogue between the two re: planning had progressed."

- Tutor:
"...It looks like a promising planning team."
- Tutor:
" I felt that T is going to help her when needed but in such a way that she can take the initiative herself."
- Tutor:
" Definitely a team here too. Suggestions taken and worked out in a feasible way. This seems to be the ideal teaching practice situation and likely to produce the maximum results for the student in the least stressful way.....I can see that as I am most happy with the student that there will be a tendency to spend less time here."
- Tutor:
" We agreed that in the light of T looking cross at finding the class not adhering to the timetable."
- Tutor:
"Most of my concern has been around two features, the student relationship with the teacher, and that the teacher seems to be out a lot. She was away all last week. S, although very sound, needs more re-assurance."
- Tutor:
" S's first two weeks involved getting the relationships and balance of authority/working time between the teacher and the student, and a joint realisation the the student must do it her way to begin with."

The relationships between the members of the trios produced a very complex interaction system. At times this was best described as a series of pairs working together. During the tutor discussions the continuous nature of the teacher/student teacher pairs featured very prominently and

this was also the case in the discussions within the teacher groups and the student teacher groups. It has also been argued that the nature of the responsibility of the tutor requires him/her to respond to and influence the relationship between the teacher and the student teacher. Drawing on the data from the studies it was possible to describe the working relationships which were built up between these teachers and these student teachers. In order to do justice to the variety of these relationships certain characteristics were picked out from specific pairs, tested against the accounts of that particular pair and then tested against the accounts and behaviour of the other pairs. In this way "simplified" types were built up against which the "actual types" were tested for match. In order to facilitate discussion the types were named "teacher/pupil", "collaborators", and "protagonists".

Not surprisingly, since the same influences were in play, there was a correlation between the student teacher/teacher relationships and the described supervision behaviour of the individual tutors, especially when the tutors were experienced people. The salient features of each type are described below.

Collaborators

In this example the pair were likely to get on very well indeed and to be like one another in a number of ways, especially in attitudes and beliefs and often in age. There was a noticeably strong sense of teacher commitment to the student as well as to the class. The student took over many of the aims and much of the organisation of the teacher, apparently because s/he believed them to be appropriate. Within this framework the student was likely to have lively, inventive ideas of her/his own. There was regular discussion and especially evaluation of the results of each session and of the children's progress. There were very likely to be lively discussions of alternative approaches probably leading to the conclusion that their way (i.e. the one of the teacher and student) was best. There was likely to be a lot of team-teaching involving a perfectly natural, friction-free change of roles between the teacher and the student. The way in which the teaching sessions of the teacher and the student merged into each other was noticeable.

Teacher/pupil

In this case, the student, for a variety of reasons, was ill prepared, insecure or uncertain about how to proceed. S/he was often lacking in self confidence; without the necessary previous experience; faced with a complex classroom structure. Whatever the case the student did not feel competent to deal with the class routine as it was or to have a specific, viable alternative of her/his own. Under these circumstances a successful outcome was likely to be effected by the teacher devising a programme whereby

the student might be successfully initiated step by step. The teacher was likely, either to set aims for the student or to help her/him do it for her/himself. The teacher was also likely to play a dominant role in lesson planning, and to use strategies, initially, to make matters easier for the student (eg helping to prepare the material, taking out a group of children).

Protagonists

In this instance, for a variety of reasons, the student chose not to take over the teacher's classroom routine. This might have been because s/he did not know how to (which could have produced a teacher/pupil situation) or that s/he saw it as too complex or that s/he was aware that it was an inappropriate style for her/him. Here co-operation was effected with the realisation on the part of the teacher, that her/his aims could be achieved in different ways. Perhaps this type of situation more than the others required great tolerance and support on the part of the teacher who might under these circumstances be required to give the student considerable latitude to make mistakes as well as offering last-minute and on-the-spot support. Team teaching might take place but often as a support to make the situation an easier one in which the student could innovate. Discussion was often about strengths and weaknesses of different approaches and could reflect real differences of opinion. It was possible for this to be highly productive in terms of helping the teacher to re-think ideas.

APPENDIX 5

THE EXPERIENCE OF THE PARTICIPATING TUTORS
IN THE THIRD STUDY

The experience of the participating tutors in the third study

<u>Tutor</u>	<u>Curriculum/ Education</u>	<u>Age Phase</u>	a = previous b = first time	
1	Curriculum	Junior		b
2	Education	EYS (S)		b
3	Education/Curriculum	Junior (S)		a
4	Education	Junior (S)		a
5	Education	Junior		b
6	Curriculum	EYS		b
7	Curriculum	EYS		b
8	Education	EYS (S)		a
9	Education	Junior (S)		a
10	Curriculum	Junior		b
11	Education/Curriculum	Junior (S)		b
12	Education/Curriculum	EYS		a
13	Curriculum	Junior		b
14	Education	EYS (S)		b

EYS = Early years of schooling

"S" refers to tutors who are involved in serial practice as well block teaching practice

"a" refers to tutors who had participated in the previous study.

"b" refers to tutors who were participating for the first time

APPENDIX 6

A COPY OF THE INFORMATION ABOUT THE TYPOLOGY
WHICH EACH PARTICIPATING TUTOR RECEIVED
PRIOR TO THE TEACHING PRACTICE IN THE THIRD
STUDY

No co-operation	
Characteristics and Cues	Action
<p>Uneasy relationship. Pair spend little time together. Little exchange of information or teacher monitors student carefully and critically but without participating.</p>	<p>Encourage discussion as much as possible either in trio or in pairs with tutor acting as intermediary. Perhaps make use of diary or skills sheet as a starting off point. Try to envisage which "style" might "fit" best.</p>
Relationships between "types"	
<p>In practice pairs will often show characteristics of more than one type. e.g. Teacher/Pupil - collaborators; e.g. there is clear collaboration with the teacher showing student some specific skills. Collaboration - protagonist. e.g. The teacher recognises great differences in style and actively encourages and supports the student in trying out new ideas - etc.</p>	

Characteristics	Teacher - Pupil Cues	Action
<p>Diffident student showing a lack of confidence and competence</p> <p>Confident, competent, possibly dominant teacher</p> <p>A class structure and organisation which the student cannot follow</p>	<p>Student reluctant to discuss; reluctant to try things out; finds excuses for not doing things; may be very self-critical; may be critical of teacher, ill prepared disruptive class; work often not finished, sometimes not started; difficulties in beginning and ending sessions.</p> <p><u>Teacher</u>; likely to have everything in its place; well organised; definite views about what should go on in the class; may be critical; likely to be worried about the present situation.</p> <p>May be a classroom organisation which: depends on continued monitoring so that efficient change-over of activity can take place; complicated record-keeping or one which requires a good memory.</p> <p>Teacher/student discussion may be strained, short.</p>	<p>Balance individual teaching. Simplify structure and organisation.</p> <p>Relieve problem points. Encourage joint planning with fairly large teacher/tutor input.</p> <p>Agree on specific skills and type of feedback (i.e. between teacher/tutor/student).</p> <p>Make use of trio and pair discussion.</p> <p>Try to encourage a tolerant/comfortable relationship between student and teacher i.e. look for points of agreement.</p> <p>May be useful for tutor to co-operate in teaching.</p> <p>Demonstration may be useful.</p>

Characteristics	Collaborators	Action
<p>Co-operative, friendly "competent" student.</p> <p>Co-operative, friendly competent teacher.</p> <p>Common views held between teacher and student.</p>	<p>Cues</p> <p>Teacher and student express satisfaction with the situation; use of the word "we"; teacher knowledge of what is going on in student's teaching and vice-versa; regular mutual offers of assistance; regular discussion (i.e. in every spare moment); mutual requests for information and suggestions; often friendly behaviour outside the classroom; <u>either</u> makes few specific requirements of student <u>or</u> makes certain very specific requirements but freedom outside those or discussion is so frequent that guidelines are mutually approved; relaxed, easy team teaching when one takes over from the other almost without it being noticed.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>Encourage co-operation. Encourage joint evaluation of teaching and of the children's work/behaviour. Try to arrange trio discussions (you may feel like an outsider!).</p> <p>Encourage teacher and student to pick on specific aspects for consideration either using skills sheet or from your own very systematic observation of what goes on in a session.</p> <p>Tutor observation may be more useful than tutor co-operation in teaching (unless tutor has a very specific skill or specialism).</p>

See also Collaborator/Protagonists

	Protagonists	Action
Characteristics	Cues	
A competent student with a developed style of teaching	The student can deal with the class in a satisfactory way as it is; recognises the style of the teacher; can develop arguments for a different approach; may express anxiety/concern/disapproval about the teacher's style; may be outspoken.	Ensure competency of student in that situation.
A competent teacher with a developed style of teaching		In every way try to enhance good relationships and discussion. This is likely to be by a combination of pair and trio discussion.
Difference of opinion and style between the two	The teacher recognises "unease" of the student; may make remarks about what the children "need" to do; may be critical of what student is doing or wants to do; may express dissatisfaction (NB see also collaborator/protagonist) may voice some anxieties.	Work towards mutual recognition of different approach and agreement about its practice.
	Tendency for teaching of student and teacher to be compartmentalised; may be a lack of discussion, either because of time or "personality"; possibly mutual recognition of different approach.	Plan and monitor in detail the alternative strategies with the student and try to explain them to the teacher.
See also collaborator/protagonist		Encourage joint evaluation perhaps using the skills sheet.

APPENDIX Z

QUESTIONS DIRECTING THE COLLECTION OF DATA IN
THE THIRD STUDY

Questions directing the data collection on the third study

(a) 4 General questions to the tutors

1. In general terms what are you looking for when you supervise students on teaching practice?
2. What are you looking for when you go into school to see a particular student in a particular classroom?
3. What supervision procedures do you normally adopt in classrooms?
4. What actually happened when you went into a particular classroom on a particular occasion?

Questions prepared for tutor group meetings

(It is important to remember that these were "operationalised" in different ways and not addressed if the group so decided.)

Pre-practice meeting

What should supervisors be doing?

Meeting 1

Describe student/teacher interaction

Describe teacher/tutor interaction

Describe trios

What happened on your first visits?

How will you progress now?

Meeting 2

This was a summary of the first fortnight using the first summary sheet. There was also a close investigation of many issues which had arisen during the previous week's discussion, e.g.

How was tutor 2 coping with her efforts to influence the practice in the classroom?

Discussion of the factor of classroom control

How was tutor 13 managing his co-operation with the teacher over a particular aspect of the student's performance raised last time?

etc.

Confirmation of instructions about tutors' summary sheets. As well as providing the notes which were written for the student teachers, the tutors were asked to expand by filling in a simple form. The headings were:

Week

Curriculum

Notes written: yes/no

Discussion with student: yes/no

Discussion with teacher: yes/no

Discussion in trio: yes/no

Looked at file: yes/no

Comments to student

Comments from student
Comments to teacher
Comments from teacher
Nature of trio discussion
Information about the teacher/student relationship

Meeting 3

1. What information have you got about how the teacher works with the student? Possible reference to typology.
2. Does this affect how you work with the student?
3. What do you talk about with the teacher? e.g. information, strategy, raising of problems.
4. What influence do you have on (i) teacher? (ii) student teacher?
5. What "aspirations" have you for a particular student teacher?
6. What characteristics affect teacher/student teacher relationship?

Plus questions related to the previous week

Meeting 4

1. Who has got specific problems to deal with? What action is necessary? What is the place of the teacher here?
2. Who has got a very "good" student? Do you know where you want to go with them? What action is appropriate?
(This is a good example of the way some of the questioning derived both from the previous analysis and the results of the previous week. The nature of individual students had been seen as an important factor in tutor behaviour, and the previous week it had become clear that some tutors were uncertain about action to take if a student was "all right".
3. Do you go into the class with a plan in your mind?
4. What are appropriate techniques with different students? Perhaps relate this to theory and aspects of the typology. A theoretical input may be appropriate here.
5. What role do you fall into most easily? Implications for teacher?
6. What do you "do" with the teacher? e.g. Give her/him information? Ask her/him to give a certain sort of direction to the student teacher? Develop discussion?

Meeting 5

At this stage much of the questioning was specifically related to issues which had been raised in the previous meetings and to "validation" of the formulations on the typology and the framework of tutor professional knowledge, e.g.

What do you talk about with the teacher, about the children? about what the student has done? Are you: checking that everything is all right? Are you looking for

something to be wrong, talking about teaching, accessing teachers' craft knowledge, acting as a data gatherer? Much of the above was related implicitly to aspects of the typology.

Give an example of something you and the teacher have worked on together.

Give an example of a something where it would have been better if you could have enlisted the help of the teacher. What sort of issues would you expect to raise that the teacher would not raise.

Information from the tutor summary sheets and the investigator summary sheets show a lot differences in the students, especially there are the ones who do not raise issues for themselves. Comments? Can you wait for students to raise issues?

Is it possible for you to observe what the student asks you to observe?

Can teacher/student/tutor agree criteria for evaluating a teaching session?

Comment on the value of the teacher help against the worry of the teacher interference.
etc.

Meeting 6

This was taken up with extended discussion of the final summary sheet but a long list of questions was prepared more as a checklist in case issues did not arise.

1. How satisfied were you with the outcome?
2. Would you do anything differently?
3. Give examples of students learning what they should do.
4. What did your student not have a try at?
5. Would you have had the teacher do anything different?
6. Should tutors pressurise students to experiment and if so under what conditions?
7. Can teachers evaluate lesson plans?
8. To what extent is the teacher/class a hindrance to your aims for the student?
9. Did students do what you asked them to do?
10. Do students raise questions/issues themselves?
Can student evaluations raise issues for you to discuss?
11. What do you think the teacher does and what does the tutor do?
12. Has your student developed a personal style?
What was your balance between watching and joining in the teaching?

(b) Questions prepared for schools

There were common themes to these questions but they were worded to be appropriate to specific school situations. The questions were arranged to meet a particular school situation but an example will give some idea of the way this was done:

e.g. Week 3, school Q

Common to both students were questions related to: when the teacher was in the classroom; any changing patterns; use of the skill list; actions of the tutor; matching teacher and student teaching time; work in different curriculum areas.

The questions were phrased differently and there were some additions for specific classes e.g.

With S1 there was reference to the diary which the teacher was keeping and to response to individual children within the class which had been raised previously.

With S2 a particular issue had been the sort of help which the student received from the teacher and this was raised again.

(c) Questions to direct final teacher discussion

1. Student/teacher relationship. What makes it work?
2. What are the elements of student/teacher interaction? planning, criticism, discussing children's work etc.
3. Comment on the patterns of interaction over the practice.
4. What contributions have teachers made to their students?
5. Tutor/teacher relationships. Comment on the roles they take. Who does the student ask? What should the tutor contribute? What makes it work?
6. What responsibility do they feel for students training?
7. Do they want guidelines/help in what they should look for?
8. Have teachers done anything different in this practice?
9. Can teachers/students/tutors work together in a trio?
10. Does teacher/tutor role change with the "type" of student?
11. Can you think of instances where you have worked closely with the tutor or where you would have liked to work closely with the tutor?
12. Comment on the influence of the headteacher.

The intention was always that teacher would include their own agenda and they did.

(d) Questions to direct final student discussion

1. What makes student/teacher and student/tutor relationships work?
2. What did you "get" from the teacher?
3. What did you "get" from the tutor?
4. How did their roles inter-relate or otherwise?
5. Comment on the relationship between the tutor and the teacher.
6. To what extent did the three participants exchange views about the conduct of the practice?
7. What would you have liked/expected teacher and tutor to contribute?
8. Comment on the influence of the headteacher.

9. Comment on comparisons with previous school experience.
 10. How did your relationships change over the practice with (i) teacher (ii) tutor (iii) other staff in the school.
 11. Comment on any trio discussions.
 12. At the end of the practice what did/will you wish to discuss with the tutor?
 13. Do you expect the tutor to raise issues or do you bring them up?
 14. How much actual time did you spend in discussion with the teacher? and how much time did the teacher spend in the class?
 15. Did you follow up the tutor suggestions?
- Again students were encouraged to set an agenda themselves. The groups varied in their wish to do this. It should be noted that the students' final discussion came after that of the teachers and some questions were added as a result of the teachers' comments.

(e) Headings for the summary sheets at three stages of the practice

Summary sheet 1

(a) Related to the investigator

Visited the school	yes/no
Talked with the teacher	yes/no
Talked with the student	yes/no
Talked with both together	yes/no
Teacher keeping a diary	yes/no
Discussed skill sheet	yes/no

(b) Information about the student/teacher relationship collecting from investigator and supervising tutors

(1)

Teacher receives forward information from student
yes/no

Teacher/student discuss forward planning
yes/no

Teacher/student discuss availability of materials
yes/no

Teacher/student discuss children's work
yes/no

Teacher/student discuss children's behaviour
yes/no

Teacher/student discuss teaching method in advance
yes/no

Teacher/student discuss teaching method retrospectively
yes/no

(2) Tutor has spoken to teacher

yes/no

(3) Teacher/student/tutor have spoken in a trio

yes/no

(4) There is team teaching in the classroom

yes/no

These questions were derived from the emerging data

Summary sheet 2

Aggregated information from teachers/students/tutor/
investigator

1. Any changes from previous summary. Specify.
2. Use/discussion of the skill list. Specify
3. Description of teacher/student relationship. Specify.
4. Role/tasks of the tutor. Specify.

Summary sheet 3

Prepared by the investigator in the light of all the
available evidence and checked with the tutor during the
final discussion

1. Type of teacher/student relationship and why classified
like that.
2. Nature of supervision
3. Comments: these were questions raised by the
investigator about particular trios prior to the final
tutor meeting. They became part of the discussion at that
meeting.

APPENDIX 8

PROGRAMME OF THE RESEARCH

Programme of the research

The tutors were approached in the term preceding the teaching practice when all agreed to be part of the project.

The schools were also approached and some were visited in that term, but most of the arrangements and consultations were finalised in the Spring term.

13 January: Meeting with students to outline project and invite participation and give out documentation i.e. skill list.

19 January: Meeting with tutors in two groups to outline the nature of the project and give out documentation, i.e. skill list, information re: typology. Arrangements made for discussion groups.

5-23 January: School visits to outline the nature of the project and give out documentation i.e. skill list. Arrangements made for the school visits by co-ordinator.

Teaching Practice 28 January - 28 March.

Tutor group meetings

2 February, 9 February, 23 February, 2 March, 9 March, 23 March
2 meetings were held on each day, one for each tutor group.

School visits:

Block 1 28 January - 6 February
Block 2 9 February - 20 February
Block 3 2 March - 20 March

Teacher group meetings

10 March (2 meetings), 11 March, 13 March

Student meetings

24 March (2 meetings) , 26 March (2 meetings)

APPENDIX 2

SHEETS USED TO ORGANISE THE DATA IN ORDER TO COMPARE
THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Sheets used to organise the data in order to compare perceptions

Side 1

Teacher/student pair		Tutor	School
Stage 1	Info. from teacher	Info. from student	Info. from tutor
Stage 2	"	"	"
Stage 3	"	"	"

By putting together all the information from different sources about a particular stage of the practice it was easier to compare and contrast the accounts of the different people.

Side 2

1. Information about the teaching practice schemes of work.
2. Availability of tutor's teaching practice notes for each week.
3. Availability of tutor's information sheets for each week.
4. Tutor's attendance at discussion groups.
5. Whether the teacher kept a diary.
6. Teacher's attendance at discussion group.
7. Student's attendance at discussion group.
8. Visits by myself to the school.

Points of interest about co-operation, strategies, professional knowledge or general circumstances.

As well as being a means of summarising information, this side of the sheet acted to modify the judgements which were being made on the information on the other side. That is, as hypotheses were being made their credibility could be checked against the amount and quality of the information available.

APPENDIX 10

SOME EXTRACTS FORM THE TUTORS' TEACHING PRACTICE
NOTES FOR THE STUDENTS

Some extracts from tutors' teaching practice notes written for the students they were supervising

Tutor 4 organises her notes into three main sections: the particular session she is watching; the teaching practice file and previous teaching; recommendations for student action. In doing this she not only ranges widely but is also able to reinforce different points by approaching them from a different point of view. In this session she discussed with the student various aspects of teaching i.e. timing, use of voice, specific classroom procedures to which the children are used, differential provision, display. These are all discussed in context and associated with recommendations. She refers to the organisation of the teaching practice file and previous teaching. Again she makes fairly specific recommendations. Characteristically this tutor finds opportunities to praise the student and shows a good knowledge of the children in the class.

By contrast tutor 5 refers only to the introduction of the teaching session which he watched.

Tutor 11 and 14 both showed a range comparable to that of tutor 4 with rather less detail.

(a)

Tutor 4/ DS: 27 January

1 You know the children already. Well done.

2 Giving a time limit was a good idea but don't rush the children will you.

3 Also when you are giving instructions do wait until everyone is settled and be positive - don't make the time limit sound like a challenge - don't let your voice fade away towards the end of what you are saying.

4 When you stopped re pencils you waited for them to settle just a fraction longer would have been even better and don't forget the please , please.

5 You've got a nice clear pleasant voice that carries naturally. Now work at building on that - try to vary your expression, pitch, tone a little more than you are doing at the moment.

6 Do the children usually leave a space for unfinished work and if so when will they finish it? That said, you explained quite clearly.

7 File : a ring file as soon as possible please and divider for each scheme so that plans evaluations can be slotted behind each scheme.

8 My feeling here was that there was too much in the exercise unless it was diagnostic. But if it was this

should have showed as an objective is the lesson plan. Plan on paper. You're still not thinking out the stages/steps of learning. If you had eg; commas in a list, separating phrases, separating parts of speech. I think you are inviting confusion by setting out an exercise in the way you did. must think of each step, break down the task, ask yourself what knowledge you are assuming, then will all the children have this - then step by step practice eg commas in list, commas to separate ideas, then assortments. This should also show your written planning, which if you look at it carefully doesn't tell us much at all about the learning steps.

Also your notes suggest you will spend some time looking at each section but you didn't. You shot through the explanation of how to tackle, and gave the children no teaching points on which to build.

Punctuation is always difficult because children naturally will be at different levels but there needs to be some teacher input. How are they to know how to abbreviate in b. Exercise c is easier than a. Progression from easy to difficult. Try to think this out rigorously like the graphs in year 2 Lab. All that said there were plenty of positives eg you stopped the children to sort out a potentially tricky situation, and they all stopped and listened.

File

1 Yesterday's topic lesson, see comments written on file many good points

2 Evaluation

Some quite perceptive points re children's response to topic lesson. Good.

Do note why a lesson has been altered eg bulb in projector.

Try to evaluate the learning that occurred eg maps evaluation, what concepts gained

Separate evaluations for each teaching session please not one for the whole day.

3 The children section also title please, children\records, also tuck it at the back, TODAY at front, schemes and build up of lesson plans at the back.

For next week

1 Continue monitoring of standards of behaviour, quality \quantity of work, establishing your presence.

2 Be very tough on yourself in planning i.e. step by step breakdown of tasks into WHAT, HOW.

3 Work at teaching\explanation\exposition sessions at the start of each new activity teaching just enough at a time, checking for understanding, going over what you want the children to learn\think about\ make\ paint etc. I'll look for this next time and well talk it over together.

Display on the go by Friday please.

(b)

Tutor 5/ES: no date

You need to smile in this job. Don't look severe. Did you introduce this poem? You need to sell it and offer a sort of trailer. Some brief explanation is necessary. Don't read so quickly. Some may need help to follow the story. Find out if they are understanding. We need a visual aid to help create the right atmosphere. Clearly they did need help to follow the story. A few comments on each verse would have been helpful. It would have been possible to hint at what was coming next and to help them to focus their attention.

You could also do more to set the scene. They need to be able to picture it all. You could describe the atmosphere but visual aids would be better.

The plot could be a little more clearly established. At 11.25 I think we need an activity.

Tutor 5/ES: no date

Good start.

Visual aids too small. Little explanation.

Don't snap, over reaction.

Little establishment about Lake District.

(c)

Tutor 11/NS: 10 February

A lively and stimulating lesson that the children clearly enjoyed. I liked the range of calculator games that you had provided for the children. There was plenty of diversity and none of the work was bland as is sometimes the case with calculator games. The children found the work challenging, but they responded to the challenge in a positive way. I wasn't completely certain that wacky races was being used as you intended but the children were certainly using it positively. I thought your explanations were excellent, clear and supportive. Don't get concerned if the children get a little high with these activities. You must allow for the fact that they will become excited and that a little competitive edge will creep into some of the games. Don't let it get out of hand but treat it as a positive sign that the children are involved with the work

that you are providing. The Adventures in Space work is looking great and I think the general level of work is progressing splendidly. I was glad the museum visit was such a splendid success. You will get a lot of positive spin offs from the trip.

Tutor 11/NS: 3 March

By any standards your introduction was excellent but it was all the more so given that it was a windy Monday morning and the children returned from play time quite high. Your instructions were clear and unhurried and you held out for the level of attention that you required from the children. The latter were involved from the outset by your skilful use of questions and settled down to their tasks remarkably quickly. I must own up to being pleasantly surprised by the standard of the folder covers. I thought that they might have required more detailed instructions about lettering and layout than you actually gave them, but the end product seemed to indicate that this was not the case. However in future lessons of this type I think you will find it pays rich dividends if you pay attention to the following points:

1. Get the children to set out a border. It keeps the work neat and leaves a margin for error
2. Give detailed instructions regarding the size and type of lettering that you require, possibly even specifying a layout for the work.
3. Perhaps specify figure/ground relationship between lettering and illustration.

Please relax at having to change lessons at short notice when I am around. The standard and quality of your planning has more than satisfied me already and I am much more concerned about your ability to be flexible and to think on your feet both of which you did admirably this morning.

Tutor 11/QS1: 4 February

While the majority of the children made a reasonable stab at the exercise, I wonder if a number of them actually understood the maps they were working from. Personally I tend to think not. Handling a world map requires a fairly sophisticated topographic understanding and an advanced concept of mapping. These kids are on the way but they haven't arrived at that stage yet. The result was that they diligently searched and located the growing areas of the foodstuffs but they had no real grasp of the location of the respective countries. Some countries like Israel were horribly difficult for them to find and a few Anthony for example couldn't distinguish between the continental land masses and the oceans on the duplicated sheets. Considering the difficulty of the task your introduction was rather too short. Had you questioned

the children at the start, some of their misconceptions would have become apparent and you would have been better equipped to deal with the difficulties as they arose. I think it might be beneficial to do a follow up session to try and clarify the key issues.

However you did circulate to very good effect and you kept on top of the situation at all times. You now appear far more relaxed with the children and appear to be in the process of forming a good working relationship with them. This fact is underlined by the good work you are helping them to produce. The display of fruit and vegetable poems is excellent good work beautifully displayed and the letter collages are looking good.

Tutor 14/US: 9 February

Planning and preparation are excellent. You are using evaluations to organise and direct subsequent activities. You are assessing children's responses in a most effective way and providing experiences well suited to their needs. You have covered a tremendous amount of ground already: display work excellent. The exploding shapes are super. This mornings activities were most interesting. Children were involved and busy. There is a very good atmosphere in the class. You are managing to hear readers as well! and this is most commendable at this stage. Your manner with the children is very good. You treat them with respect and they obviously respond well to you. I have only one complaint you have stopped smiling !!!! Relax! and show the children you are pleased with them.

Tutor 14/US 11March

Your high standard both in planning and evaluation continues. The high standard you set for yourself is transmitted to the children in many interesting ways. They arrive at school anticipating what is to come and during discussion they are eager to share ideas. They really do listen to each others contribution. I have yet to see a bored face in this classroom. You are obviously matching activities to children's level in all areas. The book construction is going well and a most valuable learning experience recognising that their writing is for an audience. Suggestions from last week have been acted on immediately. You have been sensitive to possible problems and the display is so interesting.

This mornings session. Good beginning, children interested from the start. They knew exactly what they were doing from the start. They found each activity valuable and did not need to envy another groups task.

Student, this classroom is a pleasure to be in! The children are a delight and you have given them some

excellent learning opportunities.
Continued good progress.

Tutor 14/XS2 13 February

Evaluations

You need to make these more specific. Initial planning would appear to be all right and though you are pointing to problems you are not making these specific enough to direct future action. See previous evaluations from the 3rd of Feb. especially Maths.

Evaluation needs much more constructive detail. You are not asking why often enough, only what is happening! Work on this specifically in the next week. Even if children are working on activities you have not devised eg. Maths you can still point out problems of organisation and teaching and suggest alternative strategies or remediating activities. Can you date profiles when you make comments.

Story

Do you have any rules about story time shouldn't you establish these at the outset ? eg. moving round, reading other books.

Do you think this is the best organisation for story ? e.g. children scattered around the room ? You moving about ? I appreciate the interruptions problem. Closer proximity with the children as a group may lessen this. You are a good story reader. Good expression, sense of humour, pace etc. With better organisation this would have been a most successful session.

Tutor 14/XS2 27 February

Your evaluations show that you are beginning to recognise and plan for individuals needs. Now that you are in a more stable situation with the class you will be able to put your plans into operation and cater more effectively for the ability range in the class. Try in your evaluations, to pick out which particular problems in learning children have and suggest how you may provide for this. See where I have commented on previous evaluations. You will have to be realistic in what you can achieve with these children so acknowledge the successes you are having as well as recognising areas that need attention. Your relationships with the children are good. They show that they like you in that they value what you say about their work. Build on this and be quick to praise any advances they make. The atmosphere in the classroom this afternoon was GOOD. As soon as I came in I could see that the children were interested in what they were doing and that you were working very hard to give them the attention they need. This is probably the most difficult teaching situation you will encounter. It is very hard work but as you have recognised, challenging.

Endeavour to be meticulous about your planning and

evaluation. Inevitably things go wrong but planning and evaluation will help you to know WHY they do!!! Well done Stuart, don't let what you have achieved so far be lost.

APPENDIX 10

CASE-STUDIES

This section is made up of 29 case studies outlining the nature of the teaching practice for each teacher/student/tutor trio.

At the beginning of each case study is an indication of the data which was available in preparing the case study. Each case study is identified by a number and a code. The code indicates the school, the particular teacher and student and the supervising tutor.

Tutors are identified by numbers 1 - 14 and schools by letters A - X. Teachers and students are identified by the school to which they belong, e.g. LT is the teacher in school L and LS is the student. If there is more than one student with her/his co-operating teacher, the number 1 or 2 is added.

e.g. A/T2/S2/1 indicates:

School A
Teacher 2
Student 2
Tutor 1

1. Tutor notes, refers to the teaching practice notes given to the student by the tutor.
2. Student: discussion group, indicates whether the student attended the final discussion.
3. Tutor group with a number indicates how many of the tutor discussions were attended by the tutor.
4. Investigator: visits indicates how many times the investigator visited the school during the teaching practice to talk to teacher, student and headteacher.
5. Tutor: summary sheets, indicates whether the tutor filled in the sheets provided to give more information about each teaching practice visit. These should not be confused with the summary sheets completed by the investigator at each of the three stages of the teaching practice.
6. Teacher: diary, indicates whether the teacher kept a diary of her/his discussions etc. with the student.
7. Teacher: skill sheet, indicates whether there was an opportunity for the investigator to discuss the skill sheet with the teacher (and the student).
8. Teacher: discussion, indicates whether the teacher attended the discussion group at the end of the practice.

The case study itself is divided up into parts in order to present the information in the most meaningful way. The first three parts, i.e. Stage 1, Stage 2, Stage 3, describe the information about the situation in each trio at that stage of the practice. In other words information about stage one which was not available during stage one is not put in that section.

After the stages have been described there is a final section of comments which reviews the evidence in the light of all the information which eventually became available.

This final section is separated into 3 parts: Relationships; Strengths and Weaknesses of the student; The Nature of the Help which the Student Received.

The student teacher is referred to as "the student" and the school children in the classes are referred to as children or pupils.

At the end of each case-study the agreed classification is identified. In some cases there is an indication of what might have been a more useful teacher/student relationship.

Case-study 1 A\T2\S2\1

Tutor Notes: 4 sets
Tutor group: 2
Teacher: diary
Teacher: skills sheet
Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group
Investigator's visits: 3

Stage 1

The head-teacher in this school played a large part in informing the students about the expectations of the school and resources available. He made very detailed and specific requirements of the students in the preparation of schemes, and his requirements were different from the college requirements. The tutor appeared not to be aware of these requirements until after the beginning of the practice and then reported that he did not understand them. From the beginning of the practice the tutor expressed dissatisfaction with and animosity towards the headteacher, and a supportive, protective attitude towards the student. In the early stages the student was removed temporarily from the school because the schemes of work were not satisfactory to the headteacher.

Within the school S2 worked with S1,T1,T2 for at least part of the time in a team teaching situation. This necessitated some degree of joint planning. The headteacher insisted on seeing all lesson plans a week in advance and all key lessons for the whole practice during the first week.

During stage 1, the teacher put an important emphasis on the control of the class and the children's behaviour, the lack of detailed planning and the student's difficulties in instructing the children and putting across her ideas. She also worried that the student did not stick to her formalised plans. She did not inform the student directly about these concerns but did warn her about possible behaviour problems. The student saw herself being warned about behaviour which did not appear to be happening. She reported that she was aware of her difficulties and mistakes but did not need to be told because she could not deal with them all at once. The teacher was anxious about timing and the fact that lesson plans were often not adhered to.

There appeared to be little consultation between tutor and teacher since he advised the student not to adhere too closely to timing and planning, apparently in opposition to the teacher's worries. He did believe, like the teacher, that her relaxed manner should be modified with the whole class. The tutor praised her recognition of her difficulties as set out in evaluations e.g. a need to clarify instructions. In tutor group discussion, the tutor recognised the student as one with serious difficulties but saw the school as hostile and the class teacher not really able to contribute.

Tutor1 ".....S2 is totally different,totally.... S2 basically requires propping up at every moment and she wants me to provide the survival kit"

and "S2 is struggling to get the basics right...mum...she's operating...if there are two levels, she is operating at the lower level. She is operating at the basic level of class management and defining some content to her lessons and yet she is almost incapable of extracting a focus from this content...(we are) just discussing the individual lesson and how she struggled through it and I think it also unfortunate that S2, pretty weak, is matched with a class teacher who is not all that good"

His opinion of the other teacher in the foursome seemed to be different,

"I think one of these teachers could be very helpful....though he is constrained in the kind of help he can give (i.e. by the headteacher).

Whatever the case the tutor did not attempt to elicit the help of either teacher in the teaching team.

Stage 2

The teacher's notes referred to a noisy class, poor organisation and a lack of preparation. In the diary there were a few comments like "does she take any notice of what is suggested?", "I wonder what this leads into", "work not prepared properly". However, the reported verbal comments from teacher and student showed only support or no comment and the teacher did not share the notebook with the student. S2 suggested that after teaching sessions when S2 recognised teaching inadequacies the teacher's only comments were "to cheer me up". S2 implied that she wanted advice at this stage rather than sympathy. Comments from teacher and student suggested that the S.M.P. Maths lessons (with the organisation already defined by the teacher's past actions) were successful. Again there had been no interaction between teacher and tutor. The tutor reported positively to the student about her control and progress with questioning, making a point of praising this progress. The teacher commented on "closed questioning".

Stage 3

The investigator's notes show a rather dramatic change in relationships at this time. The notes of T2 and the report of a discussion between T1, T2 and the investigator suggest complete exasperation on the part of the teachers with the incompetence of the student, but more so by her unwillingness to listen to advice or to prepare adequately.

Investigator's notes: "General dissatisfaction. I was quite taken aback by their obvious concern re: general

unco-operative attitude, confusion, inadequate planning, non response to suggestions, little sense of purpose."

T2 had made several requests and suggestions which had been ignored. S2 reported lack of teacher help but T2 reported that the student's requests were made minutes before a lesson was due to start. T2 had repeatedly mentioned over familiarity with the children which was causing a breakdown in discipline. T2 summarised by saying, "she (S2) didn't want to know". S2's suggestion was that the teacher did "not have time to speak to me". T2 appeared not to be able to approach the tutor and T1 had missed the opportunity to speak on the tutor's last visit. The tutor's notes to the student still referred to the nice relationship with the children which "is pleasantly relaxed" but that she could afford "to inject more firmness". He appeared to have picked up "some difficulty in finding your way through a lesson to finally arrive at a destination stated in your plans."

Comments

Relationships

The situation was dominated by the initial hostility generated by the demands of the headteacher. The student reported fear and anxiety although, initially, good relationships with teacher and children. Tutor and teachers were very supportive and sympathetic (including towards weakness). The tutor never entertained the possibility of co-operation with the headteacher and made little or no attempt to work with T2.

There was what appeared to be a sudden change to disapproval of S2 by T1 and T2 in the latter half of the practice, although further discussion and reference to the teacher diary showed elements of this earlier on, masked by sympathy towards the student.

Student strengths and weaknesses

All the participants recognised the student's weakness (including herself). T1 and T2 picked up weakness in discipline, organisation, sense of direction, clarity of instructions/questioning, lack of preparation. The tutor was much slower to accept all of these but his own comments eventually came close to the judgements made by the teachers.

Nature of support/help received

In the early stages of the practice the teachers, while recognising weakness, did not usually discuss this with the student. When T2 did discuss the children's behaviour her judgement seemed to be at odds with that of the tutor and the student did not accept her warnings. Later when T1 and T2 began to make more specific comments these were, according to their reports, ignored by the student. The student reported that (i) she could only cope with a limited amount of advice (ii) she could not understand the advice given by the teacher (iii) the tutor did not have

long enough to talk to her about her weakness (iv) she only ever asked advice of her fellow students. She found herself faced with what appeared to be insuperable difficulties. At no time until the end of the practice, did T1 and T2 discuss these problems with the tutor.

The tutor relied quite heavily on the student's own lesson evaluations. Using these and his observations he eventually picked out the problems but, according to the report of the student, could only let her "find my own way to solutions".

Classification There was a lack of co-operative action here but S2 appeared to be a student who could have benefited from a teacher/pupil relationship in the early stages of the practice.

Case-study 2 A/T1/S1/1

Tutor notes: 4 sets
Tutor group: 2
Teacher: diary
Teacher: skill sheet
Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

The individual requirements made by the headteacher in this school and the consequent reported hostility generated in the tutor have already been described in case-study 1. The tutor described this student as "doing wonderfully well in that environment". The tutor notes referred to good control, management, and relationships. The teacher's diary referred to similar aspects of the student's teaching but in more detail, as well as certain other points which he did not discuss with the tutor or the student. As with T2 there was some emphasis in his reports given to lessons which had moved away from the written lesson plan. There were also some warm notes of praise.

Stage 2

Not only the tutor but T1 and S1 referred to the constraints laid upon the relationships by the headteacher. The teachers' references to written lesson plans which were not actually taught by the students were a response to direct requests for this information from the headteacher. T1 in both diary and interview was earnest in his praise of the student and anxious to show the work she had done and the progress she had made. At this stage his comments to the student often came in the form of a description of the reaction of the children to her teaching (e.g. that they had really participated well in P.E., thoroughly enjoyed the Art, not quite understood the Science). The student was extremely reluctant to ask for help thinking that it would be construed as lack of planning. The teacher was still sometimes referring to specific teaching points (e.g. "don't tackle too much", "good clearing away", "not quite ready for tidying away"), which he had not discussed with student or tutor (as with S2 the diary was not shared with the student). However, he and the tutor had watched a P.E. lesson together which each had appraised independently and similarly. T1 expressed great satisfaction at this. It was at this stage that the tutor commented on the fact that T1 could be very supportive to the student but for the role thrust upon him by the headteacher.

"....so I'm not going to make any progress in that direction which is a pity because I think one of those teachers could be very helpful indeed.... though he is constrained in the kind of help he can give,"

The tutor had also made a judgement of S1, at this stage, which he saw as influencing his later supervision behaviour.

"S1 is assertive in a way in which S2 isn't and I think the way I work relates very closely to my

estimation of how competent the student is...so S1, who is very assertive, knows what she is doing, has developed a really clear-cut philosophy across the curriculum of how she wants to teach which is nice to see and she is doing her utmost to put that into practice".

This was the student about whom he said:

"....and I'm quite happy to let that student go off and "hang herself" if she wants to.... fly a bite....demonstrate just how good she is, and I'm quite happy to let that happen.... so we basically operate at two levels... with S1 by saying well how does your particular approach apply across the curriculum, which is a much higher operation than discussing individual lessons."

It was noticeable here that the tutor only watched "snatches of story" while really giving his attention to the lesson being taught by S2, who was causing him concern. The student reported that the tutor was supportive but had left no specific comments in the file, just reported verbally that "it is all right". His notes when he gave them offered praise for organisation, management and sense of purpose.

Stage 3

The teacher's record was full of praise for the working relationship, working atmosphere, improvement in planning and the student beginning to "slow up and recognise the possibilities of her teaching". Both S1 and T1 referred to the mutually helpful relationship they were now experiencing (e.g. the re-planning of a Science lesson together). S1 reported a steady input of comments and materials from T1 and implied the investigator's role in achieving this. The tutor's comments were now very short indeed, offering positive but generalised feedback. The teacher expressed a wish to talk "professionally" with the tutor and regretted that he had not been able to do that. He very much enjoyed having a student in the class with the opportunities it afforded for re-thinking teaching behaviour.

At this stage the tutor could no longer find time to come to the discussion groups but suggested that S1 was "fine", and there were problems with S2 which "were taking up my time". It was apparent that he disliked visiting the school and wanted only to see the end of the teaching practice.

Comment

Relationships

As described in case-study 1, a degree of hostility was apparent in the relationships in the early stages. Throughout the teaching practice, S1 spoke of the generally friendly and supportive attitude of the tutor but his lack of time. In the final discussion she talked in some detail about the feeling of being "isolated" and "left out" when

all the attention was centred on the much weaker S2. In her opinion the tutor's time was given to supporting this colleague to the extent that she questioned the advisability of putting two students in one school. Student and teacher referred to the constraints put on their relationship by the situation in the school and the fact that it took a long time to develop confidence in their relationship. The tutor never really saw the possibilities of any sort of co-operation "in that school".

Student's strengths and weaknesses

Both teacher and tutor referred to the independence and assertiveness of this student. During the first half of the practice there was a strong degree of consensus between T1 and the tutor (unrecognised by the two). Later the tutor's comments were unspecific and comparison between the two was no longer possible. S1 referred to her own sense of what she wanted to do:

"I know exactly what I want to be and I wasn't going to have that bigot (i.e. headteacher) tell me what to do. If he wasn't prepared to listen to me, I certainly wasn't prepared to respect himI had expectations about what was quite appropriate and I had no problems in the past (i.e. on other teaching practices), so why should I this time."

Both T1 and the tutor also praised her teaching, organisation and management. On more than one occasion T1 remarked that he would use her ideas (e.g. a "superb" Art lesson, A "first class" Movement lesson).

Nature of the support/help received by the student

In the early stages of the practice S1 received some moral support from the tutor, and some comments on her teaching. Although T1 was commenting in his diary he was not sharing these details with S1. With the increasing confidence and competence of the student, the tutor left her "to do as well as she can do" and concentrated his efforts on S2. However, at this same stage the relationship between T1 and S1 began to be less wary and the teacher was able to contribute a great deal more in planning and organisation as well as in offering feedback.

Investigator's notes: "When I talked to S1 she said T1 was much more helpful and had I said anything to him. Then she said he was now less in the classroom but discussed e.g. re-planning Science, and gave an input of materials and comments. But S1 wanted to know what he thought about her teaching. She didn't want to ask him she wanted him to contribute his comments"

The last comments illustrate the sensitivity of this relationship, where each recognised that it had taken a long time to build up a feeling of trust. In the same field notes is the following comment:

"S1 wanted to experiment with group work as had been her plan at the beginning of the practice but was reluctant because the headteacher had told the teachers to, now, leave the students in full charge, for the last fortnight."

to quote S1 "its too late to experiment when you are on trial""

Classification The relationship between S1 and T1 was slow to develop because of the situation in the school. The evidence suggests that a very effective and co-operative protagonist relationship could have been developed.

Case study 3 B/T/S/2

Tutor notes: 6 sets
Tutor group: 6
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits.

Stage 1

A number of circumstances affected the early stages of this teaching practice. As well as missing a preliminary visit the student missed the first week of the practice through illness. Two weeks before the practice started a supply teacher took over the class on the surprise re-deployment of the previous teacher. The accounts of all the participants described the classroom as very untidy and disorganised, and the children as noisy and difficult to control. Neither teacher nor student approached the class with any confidence. S was given complete freedom to do what she wanted and this was not easy in a class which had no routines and little complete equipment. She described her relationship with the teacher as "like chatting to one of my friends at college". T did not offer any advice but listened to what S wanted to do and then helped her with such tasks as putting cards in books and putting these on the tables. They talked about the children with particular emphasis on their behaviour which was a problem for both student and teacher.

The tutor had an important advisory role. Very early on she had recommended to S that she move away from class teaching to an integrated day. As a result S had spent a very long time planning a programme of activities for each group. Paramount was the serious problem of disorganisation and lack of equipment. The tutor reported sitting with the children and trying to establish relationships and in the discussion raised the general problem of "trying to change a system".

Stage 2

The teacher appeared to be still interested and supportive but making no professional input.

Tutor: "No, it gave you the impression it was shared because there was shared concern in the difficult situation which the teacher also faced. She'd only just come into the classroom....and was full of the problems herself, which is why I think I also play a different role...because when I go in I go in to look at what she's been doing, to help and think what we might do next in a way that the teacher would perhaps be doing...but she opts out from that, doesn't she?"

The student agreed with this and the teacher also to the extent that she did not want to "impose an opinion on anyone". The tutor's notes were full of suggestions for a range of activities, practical experiences for the children, centres of interest in the classroom, opportunities for play and unstructured writing. There were signs that she was trying to steer the student away from a

concentration on organisation and control towards an emphasis on what the children were learning. The tutor reported a mismatch between S's "very good ideas and grandiose aims" and how she was going to achieve them in the difficult circumstances in this class.

Tutor: "...There was no sort of order and sense of what she was going to do, how she was going to have areas of experience"

At the same time the tutor was quick to praise the "busy atmosphere" and "sensitivity in handling the children", first to encourage S and, secondly, because of the genuine attempts at implementation. The tutor reported a sense of satisfaction in this class because she recognised the input she was making.

Stage 3

At this stage the sense of purpose seemed to evaporate. There was no professional input from the teacher. The student appeared tired and dis-spirited, just "hanging on" until the end of the practice. In her reported conversation with the tutor she expressed the view that she was doing "everything she possibly can in this situation" and "that it is no use letting some children do play activities because they only distract the others". She also referred to anxiety about her report from the headteacher that was imminent. The tutor was still pressing for positive action, better planning, evaluation of the children's activities. She was still offering specific advice but her final summary sheets referred to "inadequate lesson plans impossible to evaluate" along with the uncharacteristic comment "I felt quite cross and worried". The reported response of the student was a "catalogue of problems" and reports of working until one o'clock in the morning.

Comments

Relationships

The relationships between all members of the trio were friendly throughout the practice. However, neither student nor tutor envisaged a professional relationship with the teacher (except possibly during the first week of the practice). A positive, professional relationship was maintained between tutor and student throughout. This was modified by a sense of frustration felt by both towards the end of the practice .

Student's strengths and weaknesses

In her notes and in the discussion the tutor was able to praise the student for certain aspects of her performance e.g. her initial very good plans, her initial willingness to confront a very difficult situation, her sensitive personal relationships with the children. Even her criticisms of the student implied the ability of the student to change the classroom situation if she chose. The major criticism was that she gave up too soon and was prepared to, accept that she could not change anything.

Tutor: "I think she teaches like the teacher teaches"

and I think she uses the excuses the teacher uses, and in a way that's not her fault because she has worked with that teacher really.... but I still feel that she hasn't really worked as she should have done"

and "I don't really see the evidence of her having it, but she is reckoning that she has and because of all these difficulties then it hasn't worked."

Nature of support and help received

All the participants, including the headteacher, recognised the very serious difficulties which faced the student in this classroom. Although the teacher was friendly she made no professional input. Very early on in the practice she was timetabled to work with other classes, but also she reported a conscious decision to "leave S to get on with it".

Teacher "In my case S had plenty of ideas and seemed to know what she wanted to do and so I left it to her and just stood back and let her get on with it."

The tutor had very specific ideas about how Infant classes should be run and sound advice about the implementation of these ideas. For a large part of the practice she shared these ideas with S but at the same time, was sympathetic to the difficult situation in which S was placed. In the final discussion she blamed herself for allowing this sympathy to modify the demands she made of S.

Tutor: "I have felt very disappointed with her actually during the last two weeks I've been in...I do yes...because I feel I have learnt an awful lot. I feel I would have done some things differently in the light of the experience I have had... because I have made a lot of excuses for her... ...and I think sometimes she has relied on those for not making some of the efforts I think she could have done."

and "...and so I feel that I have let her down in a way because I haven't pushed her far enough and she has let herself down by opting out in terms of these constraints instead of trying to change them....but she seemed to start to change them, then in the last two weeks she's restricted again"

Perhaps not surprisingly the student saw the situation differently:

"I think that..well...my tutor was very good and I really got on with her but I don't think she understood some of the things that were there....and I don't think she understood what state my classroom was in. It was just like a bombed site and I had to start tidying up and sorting everything out....and I don't really think she appreciated that."

Probably the tutor approached the truth when she suggested

(see above) that her role in this school included what the teacher might normally be expected to do, and she was not altogether equipped to do that, without the intimate knowledge which a class teacher would normally have of her/his class.

Classification In a professional sense the teacher/student relationship was not productive. In that unusual situation there was potential for a collaborative relationship comparable to that developed by XS2/XT2.

Case study 4 C/T1/S1/3

Tutor notes: 6 sets
Tutor group: 5
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: skill sheet
Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

Investigator's notes for the first visit suggest "a lot of talk going on between two fairly forthright people, with their own ideas. T1 has made an obvious contribution to resources and ideas especially in Science and Geography." T1 was anxious to know what contribution she should make but expressed no anxieties about the student's teaching or attitude. There are no formal arrangements for discussion or monitoring of planning/teaching, but there is a lot of friendly interaction. The discussion is spontaneous but not in the form of precise statements about how S1 should do things. There is little comment on teacher performance but considerable discussion of the children's work".

The tutor's notes show detail and range. After expressing satisfaction about classroom control, she offered quite detailed comments on extensions or improvements to the lessons, including past lessons which she had read about in the file. The tutor referred to forthright discussion with teacher and student where both contributed equally. She commented on a disagreement with the school about the use of the Language scheme, and the fact that the strong relationship between teacher and student made her influence less sure. She made attempts via her notes to influence at least the way the student taught the language material but at the same time expressed serious dissatisfaction with the scheme during tutor discussions.

Stage 2

The reports of all the participants suggested a further development of the social relationships between student and teacher but much more occasional professional discussion. T1 and S1 reported how the teacher reinforced S1's control techniques by praising or reproving children's during the student's sessions (as reported to her by the student). The teacher also made some suggestions about "stretching the bright children in Maths". However, the investigator's notes read "talk still goes on but not at quite the professional level I had anticipated from the previous visit". T1 and S1 worked in a parallel way with no overlap of content and little co-operative discussion. The tutor also expressed concern about this e.g. from the summary sheet : "I'm not sure how much the teacher sees S1 in operation", and from the tutor's discussion :

Tutor : ".....but disappointing in the sense that she (S1) is not being extended. I have the feeling and I intend to look into this this week but S1 has been off sick, that the teacher spends very little time in the class with her, that she is happy with what S1 is doing and

that their patterns of teaching are fairly similar i.e. quite a lot of what is basically class teaching or unimaginative group work where they follow material from the Language scheme from the book. So the growth I had expected hasn't taken place."

At this stage there was not a lot of reported input from the tutor to the student (judging from the tutor discussion and from her T.P. notes). However a discussion of the skills sheet took place between teacher, student and investigator and generated an unexpected amount of discussion.

Investigator's notes: "The skill sheet discussion kept raising problems with the Science e.g. explanation (the teacher brought this up) , how to use equipment with such a large group. This led to the teacher suggesting a demonstration lesson followed by part of the class writing up and the others continuing the experimentation. The skills list seemed to give the teacher the opportunity to mention things which were on her mind - She started to say things and then hurriedly said "I'm not criticising" - it also gave her a chance to make suggestions. I believe that the present climate does not encourage that - needs a push".

Stage 3

Information from all the participants suggested a great deal more activity. The tutor's notes again became detailed in the way they were in stage 1. They contained praise for certain aspects of S1's work and there was an emphasis on looking for "a higher level response" e.g. "make the children think" and "respond to individuals". Attention was given to Maths teaching and further concern expressed about the Language scheme and the constraints it put on other areas of the curriculum. There was still tutor concern about the teacher "not pushing S1" but a trio meeting produced some lively discussion. The investigator's notes suggest much more co-operative teaching e.g. in Science and Art to help the student develop group work. T1 and S1 had had extensive discussion about control techniques, especially about "keeping the noise level down". The teacher expressed dissatisfaction with the tutor (i) because of her criticism of the Language scheme (ii) because of her criticism of the student's plans before she taught a lesson.

Comment

Relationships

Throughout the practice there was a strong positive social relationship between teacher and student. This did not extend to the tutor.

S1 : "I don't know,... there's something about her that I ... I got on with her but not as much as I did with the last tutor (i.e. on the previous practice), and the teacher didn't particularly like her either...or the head

teacher."

This antipathy influenced the professional relationship:

S1 : "Nobody particularly liked her, so therefore nobody wanted to listen to anything she said."
and "...my teacher, she said..er..she was very blatant about how she felt...but everything that my tutor said and wrote down about lessons, my teacher would read and say "I don't agree with that" and so everything my tutor said the teacher just said "Oh! that's not practicaland she didn't like the way she came in before a lesson and said "What are you going to do?" and then said "that's not the right way to do it""

During the teacher discussion group T1 repeated these points but in a less critical fashion. The evidence suggested a close social relationship between teacher and student which excluded the tutor.

As well as this there were misunderstandings on the part of the teacher about the positive role which the tutor expected her to take. This was not only a lack of information but a certain resentment about the amount of responsibility expected of her. For her part the student criticised the fact that the tutor always acted as an outsider never joining in with the life of the classroom.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

The basic competence of this student was not questioned by either teacher or tutor. However, the tutor expressed extreme disappointment with the practice because of the lack of progress she felt that the student had made.

Tutor: "No I was terribly disappointed with my practice this time. I can't really quite decide why it was. I think it was having one student I thought was going to be very good (i.e. S1) and one student I realised very early on was going to be very weak....then all the effort and problem going towards the weak one.....and having to go into school feeling perhaps I had been over hard on the weak one and not wanting to appear to be going on the same line with one I thought would be good but didn't come up with it.... In the end I fell between two stumps."

Support and help received by the student

This trio relationship was characterised by a number of misunderstandings which influenced the help which the student received. Throughout the practice the student benefited from the support of the teacher when the teacher judged that the student needed it. However, during the middle section of the practice T1, while maintaining a very friendly relationship, offered little professional help and no stimulus for the student to change her teaching behaviour. A combination of circumstances produced more positive action towards the end of the practice. These circumstances included the discussion of the skills sheet with the investigator (it should be noted that no pressure

was applied by the investigator for teacher and student to change their behaviour, just that the two began to talk about professional matters) and the rather sudden (i.e. in the eyes of teacher and student) new requirements made by the tutor for the student to extend her teaching repertoire.

T1 : "Yes because its coming up now (i.e. pressure for group work) and we have got a week (i.e. of the practice) to go and we are still trying to work towards this goal which should have been defined along, long time ago."

and S1: "...there were some things I thought I couldn't cope with doing and there were some things it didn't cross my mind to do at all. Nobody ever mentioned it in college... and then the tutor said about 2/3 weeks from the end "Oh! why don't you do this?.....by which time I concentrated on that and it was all right but....."

The uneasy social/professional relationship between the tutor and the student/teacher pair coupled with the tutor's concern for the weaker student, made frank, professional discussion within the trio difficult. T1 and S1 felt they were just "doing what the tutor wanted". The adequacy of the student in the classroom and the close social relationship encouraged a sense of satisfaction with the student's teaching performance with action on the part of the teacher only made necessary by a "problem".

S1 "You try and put on what the tutor wants and not the sort of teacher you are."

Classification A friendly, social collaboration which excluded the tutor and her influence. There were indications that a more professionally effective collaboration could have been achieved.

Case study 5 C/T2/S2/3

Tutor notes: 3 sets

Investigator: 3 visits

Tutor group : 6 (2 with student in school)

Tutor: summary sheets

Teacher: skill sheet

Teacher: discussion group

Investigator: 3 visits (2 while student was in school)

Stage 1

On the investigator's initial visit T2 described the student's behaviour in this way: "has ideas but unsure how to follow through ; resources but doesn't know how to use them; lack of foresight; no account of varied ability and attention span; over-simplification in explanation; children don't know what they are supposed to do; discussion far too long with nothing to show for it; jumping about from idea to idea; no reinforcement of children's ideas; planning not thought through; in questioning does not talk to the class; not enough direction; doesn't recognise problems when they happen; does listen to children's answers but doesn't use them; listens to the noise with eyes closed." Using the items on the skills sheet these were his impressions of this student's performance. However, he did not present his anxieties to the student in this way. Keeping quiet about the catalogue of problems he invited her own comments and was appalled to hear that she was well satisfied. The investigator's notes read "the teacher reports no response from S2 to his questions. He has tried to find "nice ways" of presenting her problems to her."

From the tutor:

"T2 is determined he is going to help the student. He is finding it extremely hard to draw her out and he is trying every possible ruse he can think of to get her to talk.... He has said this each time, that he is still finding it extremely difficult to get her to open up to him. He wants her to open up so that he can help her more and he is really sort of sitting her down so that she can't escape. And he is the sweetest young man."

Within the first week the headteacher had requested the tutor to come in for a little conference. There was a group discussion involving the headteacher, the teacher, the student and the tutor. The student was given explicit advice about what to tackle and how to tackle it. She left the school to make her preparations.

The tutor described the meeting:

"He (i.e. headteacher) explained to her very gently that we weren't happy and what he felt and what we all felt of the shortcomings and then it was decided or suggested that we could help her plan much more precisely in terms of content if we focused on just two areas of the curriculum - Science and Geography - in which she was going to do most of the initiating. He suggested from what he had seen when he had

been in the classroom that her organisation was letting her down as well. He suggested that she took basically class lessons as starters and worked out from that because he felt that that would be easier for her to cope with - not that it was to be the final solution but that it was to be an intermediate solution. Then he suggested that she used a number of video tapes which gave a good input and stimulus. He then sorted out on his computer register all the videos he had got in school, with the four of us there, what might be suitable - so we had a list of programme numbers and titles for her to use and I suggested that she might be able to take the bulk of that on Friday to view and work on over the weekend. She agreed. We also decided that she should not take P.E. for a fortnight - that she should sit in on T2's lessons and write a lesson plan of what she saw them do, and that she should continue with the Maths which was the only satisfactory area. So that's the plan of campaign."

Stage 2

In the fourth week the headteacher initiated actions which led to the withdrawal of the student from the school and the course.

During this stage information from all sources except S2 suggested very serious concern. The tutor's notes show less analysis and more despairing questions e.g.

What did you hope to achieve by that?

Really you were not teaching at all!

She had asked T2 to monitor lesson plans and not allow S2 to teach if the were not adequate. T2 described her lessons as "monstrous, she acts as if she had never been in college at all". He was increasingly concerned about the detrimental effect of this student's teaching on the children, the amount of responsibility which he felt he was being given for the student (by the tutor). The student was satisfied with her performance and felt that everybody was being over critical. At this stage she withdrew.

Comment

Relationships

The attitude of the teacher towards helping a student was initially very positive . e.g. in the final discussion he said

"I mean I very much wanted a student and was looking forward to having a student."

Everybody else's comments supported this view. However, he was first disappointed and then exasperated at the student's complete unwillingness to communicate with him either professionally or socially.

The tutor appreciated the co-operative attitude of the school and delegated a great deal of responsibility to T2. He found this very disturbing.

T2 : "In my case as much as the student bothered me, I have been bothered by the attitude of the tutor in that she came in and I wondered what the role of the tutor was . I was going to look up what the word tutor meant in the dictionary just to check what I thought it meant. She was coming in and when the situation was getting really bad some of her ideas were that I should go through the lesson plans every morning with the student and if I didn't think they were good enough tell the student that she could not teach that day and so on. I said how had the student managed to get this far and supposed to be seen and she shouldn't really have done it without her."

There was a strong feeling in the school that they were taking on a responsibility which should have been the tutor's. The school initiated the withdrawal of the student but felt that it should have been initiated long before by the tutor.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

These have already been described in stage 1. Perhaps the most pertinent characteristic was the unwillingness or inability to recognise her own serious weaknesses and utilise the help offered.

Support and help received by the student.

The student felt that she received only criticism, especially from the tutor but the catalogue of problems supply some justification for this. The initial input from the tutor was extensive and analytical (e.g. description of techniques for successful questioning). However, the student appeared not to be able to benefit from these extensive notes and the restriction of teaching initiated by the head teacher seemed a step to simplify the situation for her. There is no doubt that T2 was more than willing to offer both help and support but this was not accepted despite his persistence.

Classification None because of the student's withdrawal.

Case study 6 D/T/S/4

Tutor notes: 9 sets
Tutor group: 5
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: diary
Teacher: skill sheet
Teacher: discussion

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

This stage was characterised by the very substantial and co-operative input of teacher and tutor and the reserve of the student. The tutor made four visits during the first 2 weeks (2 more than the number required), one of these at the request of the acting headteacher. Her T.P. notes showed range and detail to a considerable degree. There was also marked continuity i.e. the tutor noticed and praised the student for action taken in response to previous comments. There was evidence of the laying of a set of general rules i.e. use of file, setting out plans, use of evaluation, records, all justified to the student as a way of helping the tutor monitor the teaching. There were highly specific guidelines for future action and clear indication that the tutor had made considerable effort to get to know individual children. From the very first visit teacher and tutor worked as a team with the student. Both teacher and tutor often stayed in the classroom during the tutor's visits and special arrangements were made in school for a trio discussion. The teacher diary and investigator's notes illustrate very well the intimate knowledge that the teacher had about what the student was doing. There were detailed comments of the inadequacies of the student's teaching (not all shared with the student) as well as the tips offered to the student. There was substantial agreement between the teacher's and the tutor's notes and the pointers for future action were agreed within the trio. The investigator's notes indicated a pressure by the school to maintain school practices e.g. a specific way of using the S.M.P. Maths scheme, marking procedures, highly specific and unchangeable silent reading sessions etc. The teacher at this stage expressed concern that she was taking all the initiative in generating discussion with the student but also insisted that "I must know what is going on".

The investigator's notes suggest that for the student there was an overall sense of being torn by the demands of other people. The discussion, she felt, was dominated by whether she "had done things" and not by those things which interested her (e.g. some Science activity which she had undertaken). She expressed the feeling that the teacher acted to monitor S's actions before S had had a chance to act. It became clear that misunderstandings were caused by the fact that S chose not to inform the teacher of her actions and did not raise matters in discussion despite the fact that these were invited (i.e. as reported by teacher and tutor).

There was no doubt that there were feelings of mutual

respect between teacher and tutor (and the acting headteacher)

e.g. the tutor commented at this stage "they have been super". The tutor also recognised that the school set very high standards indeed for any student but described this student in this way:

"She can't inspire the children at all.
She is laxadaisical and she is being down-
right lazy about preparing for teaching
children."

Stage 2

The general pattern of behaviour as described above was continued into the second stage i.e. a detailed, extensive and fairly specific input from tutor and teacher. However, teacher and tutor began to take steps to encourage more active participation of the student in the discussions and in her own decision making and teaching. The investigator's notes read: "Teacher has attempted to change consultation patterns as a result of her concerns mentioned last time i.e. that she initiates everything and that she may be taking up too much of the student's time in talking. She talked to S about this and decided they should have a 12 o'clock time when S would bring up matters of concern". This was not altogether successful because S reported that she "forgot" to mention things. S described herself as "the sort of person you have to drag things out of". This issue was also addressed in the trio discussions.

Tutor: "S knows he class is wrong...some of the time she is picking this up intuitively, that the chemistry isn't right, that the children are being inattentive, fiddling, disinterested, switched off, but she is not acting upon what her own initiative is telling her to do...because eventually we decided, after discussion, it was because in the earlier days she was so anxious to maintain the patterns of working to which the the children were accustomed. She couldn't she said be herself and relax. Consequently, she's never really got a rapport with the children. She is aware of this gap but she doesn't know how to bridge it now so she is floundering.... We decided that she had to be more herself.... the target should be that when a message came through to her that the children were disinterested or whatever then she acted on it there and then."

There was evidence during this time that the professional relationship between teacher and tutor was maintained and enhanced. The acting headteacher undertook demonstration lessons in PE for the student to observe.

Stage 3

The picture during this stage was both positive and negative. S was putting certain of the techniques and suggested actions into practice. She was developing skills (e.g. S.M.P. in the way the school wanted it taught),

improving planning and actively following some of the guidelines given by the tutor (e.g. presentation of display). Both teacher and tutor expressed pleasure at certain teaching sessions only to be followed by despondency at other disastrous sessions. In the eyes of the teacher and tutor, what the student was lacking was sparkle, enthusiasm, rapport, a sense of liking the children. There was every indication that her previous performance had led to a lack of control of and rapport with the class. Silly behaviour arose too readily which the student did not control and the children were unwilling to participate, - as the teacher said "she has lost the respect of the class". This description was also evident from the tutor's notes and the tutor's summary sheets. e.g. Tutor's notes to the student in week 8

"Planning of/for session - materials not available readily; over lengthy time for discussion not fruitfully used by the children; feedback session interrupted by J, the professional disrupter".

A final comment was made by another tutor who visited the class in connection with the assessment process:

"S did not look particularly excited or enthusiastic about what was to follow, but the children behaved fairly attentively at first. As it progressed some eventually lost interest"

and :

"I do feel a certain resentment in this classroom, mainly from the children.... There is a lack of warmth in exchanges between S and the children and they never make physical contact. Its as if each is keeping the other at a distance."

Comment

Relationships

The teacher and tutor throughout the practice reported a very satisfactory professional relationship. e.g.

Tutor : "The tutor/ teacher partnership is splendid
(I think) in that we seem to be on the same
wavelength."

They tried to include the student in this professional relationship and there was evidence of a number of strategies adopted. At the same time because of the poor quality of the student's teaching they did not feel that they could relax their pressure on the student to prepare, teach and evaluate. Initially the student appeared to be excluded but there was evidence that later she also took part in trio discussions and presented her own point of view on invitation. There is some evidence that she welcomed the advice of the tutor but not that of the teacher in that she did not take any initiative in drawing on the help of the teacher. The only criticisms which she voiced were that tutor and teacher pressurised her too much in the early stages and that she did not like any criticism of her teaching to come from the teacher.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

Throughout the practice there was evidence of inadequacies in performance, some of which have been described above. It is perhaps significant that she missed two of the preliminary visits to school before the practice started. However, there was also evidence that in trying to follow the advice of teacher and tutor she developed certain important teaching skills. The concern of teacher and tutor was that she lacked enthusiasm, warmth and self criticism. BY the end of the practice both were despairing about their ability to help her any further than in the development of specific skills.

Help and support received by the student

There is no doubt about the professional input of teacher and tutor into this teaching practice. Detailed and extensive advice was offered but both also showed a degree of sensitivity to the difficulties of the student and her reserve. Strenuous efforts were made to involve her in evaluation of her teaching. However there was also evidence that both tutor and student felt a strong pressure to maintain the working situation and standards of the school. The tutor referred to this in the tutor discussion and the student reported feeling pressurised from the beginning.

S : " That's my biggest mistake (i.e. trying to put what the tutor/teacher wants and not the sort teacher you are). I was very impressed by the methods and organisation in my school and I thought - not to copy - but to try and keep some of them in that classroom, which is what I started to do. So I was doing things that my tutor wanted me to do and my class teacher wanted me to do but it didn't work for me because it wasn't me."

and "I couldn't understand why they didn't take those first five days just to look and then to sort of come together in the second week and say - well that's not going to work if you carry on with this class like this."

Put alongside these accounts must be those of the class teacher and tutor describing the totally inadequate teaching and their feeling that the student was simply not prepared to put in the necessary amount of work. Yet again alongside that must be laid the very precise requirements which were being made of the student in maintaining the school procedures to the last detail.

Classification A teacher/pupil relationship which was influenced by the stringent requirements of the school and was partially successful in helping the student to develop the skills which the school asked for.

Case study 7 E/T/S/5

Tutor notes: 6

Student: discussion group

Tutor group: 1

Investigator: 3 visits

Teacher: diary

Teacher: discussion group

Stage 1

The tutor reported that this student was left alone (i.e. without any surveillance by the school staff), for the first week "to let her settle down". The investigator's notes suggest "a distinct unease" on the part of the student. She described herself as being sharp with the children and uncomfortable with the class teacher, especially when she was in the classroom with the student. She reported that the class teacher was too busy to discuss with her although there had been some discussion of the children's behaviour and "some chat". The student's report was at odds with the reception the investigator had with the class teacher.

Investigator's notes : "A quite different picture from above (i.e. student's unease about teacher's co-operation) - first a social chat and then a very long, very useful discussion about teaching - very detailed - e.g. concerned about rapport with the children, little warmth, can't get more than single answers to questions, can't develop discussion. Teacher has tried to intervene to show her e.g. "tell Miss C what you think". This is the major problem but also a lack of planning i.e. has good ideas but does not think in advance about the implementation....T feels she must intervene for the sake of the children but does not know how to do it sensitively" She had not expressed these anxieties to the tutor and did not feel that she was able to do so.

The tutor had made some analysis of the lessons he had watched e.g. "poor introduction", "quite good start", "lack of visual aids", "lack of exploitation of the material". On the first visit he had informed the teacher of his comments. He did not invite comment from the teacher or the student.

At this stage the investigator tried to encourage teacher/student discussion by taking the class to allow teacher and student to discuss the skills sheet (at their request).

Stage 2

There was a more relaxed atmosphere with some interaction between teacher and student. T reported a noisy but productive Science lesson. S again reported that the teacher's responsibilities as acting headteacher meant that she had a lack of time for discussion.

The tutor's notes as well as the comments of the student indicated that he had given attention only to the lesson he watched and to nothing else in the student's file. His comments were all related to class teaching e.g. board work, class questioning, "hold them as a class", "encourage class spirit", "develop a composition on the board" The class teacher on the other hand was more worried about the

needs of individuals in the class and differential provision for them.

Stage 3

The investigator's notes revealed a very unhappy situation: "Spoke to S first - told me about being very unhappy- everything going wrong- mostly control with the children naughty most of the time. A movement and a Science lesson were particularly chaotic. The former had been stopped by another teacher."

S had been reluctant to discuss her problems and her planning with the teacher because she felt that T was implying that she, S, was asking because she was not prepared to do the work herself i.e. that what she was planning to do should already be in her schemes. The headteacher had discussed problems with her and given her some specific guidance. The tutor was unaware of the gravity of the situation because S did not want him to know of her weaknesses, he never read the file and had not been in contact with the class teacher. The only discussion between student and tutor took place in the classroom while the student was teaching.

The student's difficulties were substantiated by the account of the teacher as shown in the investigator's notes:

"When I spoke to T she enlarged on this (i.e. S's account)- had been very worried about control and what was happening to the class - pointed out that the children were not really naughty....T was very worried about the antagonism S was generating in the children and the fact that she acted as if she was frightened of them."

There were further accounts of incidents when S had, unknowingly, acted against the ethos and rules of the school, and used "unacceptable strategies" to control the class. T also made a number of comments about teaching behaviour (e.g. inadequate instructions, setting work which was inappropriate for the children.)

The tutor had not been informed and, in fact, had not visited the school for two weeks. The headteacher had asked the class teacher to inform the investigator of the situation. This obliged the investigator to make some suggestions to enhance the co-operation between the participants and to inform the tutor of the nature of the difficulties. There was some improvement after this up to the end of the practice.

Comment (notice a lack of information from the tutor here)

Relationships

A lack of communication between the participants was a significant feature of this teaching practice. The student reported feeling very ill at ease in the school.

S : ".....my teacher said to me "oh I don't feel as if it is my class any more, and that made me feel guilty"
and " I think it was very cliquey....it was a very long time before I felt more accepted and

and that was about two weeks from the end"
and "...then when she went home she used to say
to me "I'm going home to (husband) now
and I keep asking him how I can help S....
But she would never never come up with any
ideas about how she could help meI
think she had just given up on me really"

T never expressed antipathy to the student and on each occasion when the investigator suggested joint ways of working she responded. Her discussions with the investigator were detailed but she reported that she did not have similar discussions with the tutor and there was no co-ordinated action planned between them.

Towards the very end of the practice S did mention her anxieties to the tutor and felt that he was "on her side". However she reported that during the practice discussion was severely limited and only took place in the classroom while she was actually teaching.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

All the participants recognised that the student was having difficulties although the nature and extent of these was viewed differently by different participants. Most noticeably there were problems of discipline but there were related problems of "floundering around for ideas", lack of detailed planning for implementation of ideas, difficulties in implementation, "boring and tedious tasks set for the children", or a tendency to "over stimulation". A very serious problem in the eyes of the teacher, the headteacher and the student was the antagonism generated in the children.

Support and help received by the student

The lack of communication and lack of co-ordination between the participants served to leave the student isolated when she needed very considerable support. The teacher could give a very detailed analysis of the shortcomings but was unwilling or unable to offer this in the form of advice to the student. There was evidence to suggest that with considerable encouragement and with an amelioration of relationships this would have been possible (see the effects in the short term of the enforced action of the investigator). The tutor did not see this as part of his role and restricted himself to informing the teacher of his analysis. In advising the student he restricted himself to an analysis of the particular session he watched and within those sessions he concentrated on the class teaching elements. As a result the range of his advice was very narrow indeed and he was unaware of the often more serious problems the student was experiencing in other sessions. Only at the end of the practice did the student discuss her problems with him. At this stage he attributed her poor performance to "nerves". After a discussion in college he wrote this:

"S lost her confidence. She didn't feel
at ease with the teacher. Felt she had a good
second year practice doing what comes

naturally. This time it didn't work that way
and not knowing the mechanics of teaching
she couldn't sort it out."

There is little evidence that she had help in acquiring the
mechanics of teaching in that practice.

Classification An unsatisfactory professional relationship.
The student would have benefited from a teacher/pupil
relationship in the early stages.

Case Study 8: F/T/S/6

Tutor notes: no
Tutor group: 4
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: diary
Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group
Investigator : 3 visits

Stage 1

(The first school visit actually took place on the first day of stage 2 but was considered along with the data for stage 1).

The most noticeable characteristic of the data for this section was the extreme sensitivity which the teacher showed in her relationship with S. The diary was openly shared between them and included praise for interesting work which S had prepared. Each item was presented as a discussion point leading to an agreed strategy. Any point of concern which had not been raised with or by the student was not included in the diary. In fact the teacher made it clear that she was reluctant to raise issues herself and waited for the student to raise the issues. The investigator's notes read :

"Nearly always waits for S to raise issues because she feels that S "can only take in so much at once". An example of this is the wall frieze. S put up a frieze which she had prepared entirely herself i.e. not the children's work. T waited until the children had made some figures with which they were very pleased and then suggested that they should be added to the frieze. This was instead of telling S that it was not a good idea to put up a frieze made entirely by the teacher".

This particular incident also illustrated the co-operative relationship developing between teacher and tutor. The tutor had been unhappy with the unstimulating display and discussed it with the teacher who found a good way of putting it right. Also the tutor and the student had begun to discuss extending the student's teaching time but again the details of the implementation were left to the teacher and student. The teacher always made herself available to the student and was very willing to step in when things went a bit wrong (e.g. running out of circles for the collage).

Stage 2

This stage was characterised by a joint effort in setting up an integrated day in this classroom. The suggestion came out of a trio discussion and implementation was discussed in detail between student and teacher and put into practice gradually starting with team teaching until the student took over completely. The teacher explained her own way of organising group work but both S and T were happy for S to adapt the suggestions and develop a way which she found most comfortable and effective for her. Again the teacher was most tolerant of the need for the student to experiment. The investigator's notes read :

"From discussion with T I suspect that this (i.e. S's method of implementation) is leading to some fussiness on

the part of the children i.e. following S round - T feels it when she takes them herself. Will not bring this up with S but will wait for the right moment, probably when S brings it up herself."

S was aware of the teacher's tolerance and sensitivity and most grateful for it. She had relaxed considerably and was willing now to admit her anxieties. She recognised that it was a characteristic of herself that she liked to move in her own time. Friendship as well as mutual respect were characteristic of the teacher/student relationship at this stage.

Stage 3

Basically the working relationship had the same characteristics as previously with increasing confidence on the part of the student and increasing pleasure on the parts of both teacher and student at their collaborative partnership. The student was now taking most of the responsibility but the partnership was characterised by professional discussion as well as by laughs and jokes. The discussion had now moved away from organisational matters to the progress of individual children and how this might be enhanced. Because S was now responsible for organising the school Maths and Language schemes as well as her own, the teacher was "keeping a close eye " on the progress and using her own teaching time to help any individuals keep up, again with the full agreement of S. There were further examples of the way the tutor stimulated the teacher/student discussion, e.g. at one point she suggested the need for more extensive use of free creative activities. This caused extensive discussion between teacher and student, particularly how it might become compatible with the shortage of paper in the school and the worry of the student that she might feel swamped in a situation where she did not feel herself to be in complete control. The tutor also reported at this stage that she spent a lot of discussion time dealing with points raised by the student and not herself, but that anything which she did raise was noted and discussed in detail by S and T.

Tutor : "I think she raises most things and there are some that I have brought up to begin withshe always takes notes and discusses them and tries to implement."

and "I raise things when I go in and then it carries on during the week."

Comment

Relationships

In many ways this trio seemed to represent one model of good working relationships. There was sensitivity on all sides. That between T and S has already been described but the teacher also reported the respect of the tutor for the ethos of the school. In response to a question about the usefulness of the tutor being familiar with the school, T said:

"Yes I think it would be a good idea and

getting back to this sort of what we expect of tutors, what the different role is between tutors and teachers, the tutor comes in and she sees one lesson perhaps a week and they've got to work as a team because she can only comment on that one lesson and the student that she wants to fit in with the school and her tutor wants her to fit in with the school therefore its got to be the three of us working together. If the tutor comes in and gives adverse advice to the student, she is not going to fit in with the school. So all the time the three of them have to keep talking and I have been fortunate in that I have been able to do this with the tutor and the student and myself."

Student's strengths and weaknesses

Both teacher and tutor were full of praise for the progress S made during this practice. The tutor summarised her progress in this way.

Tutor: I think she has seen the need to be more adventurous but has kept it very carefully controlled and she feels she needs to be in control of the situation and will say at this stage "I know really I should let them do it without work sheets but at the moment I am happier with them". So she can see what she should be doing but is still using the crutch. Again as far as creative work is concerned she is now saying things like "I would love to do certain things" but she couldn't because she didn't have the materials - but what she is saying I think is that she would now be able to do it in another situation."

and "I think she is half way there and in a couple of years will be full."

Help and support received by the student

The sense of purpose of this student has already been described. The help and support she received gave her the opportunity to experiment with some of her own ideas at her own pace. She had a good level of competence but sometimes a lack of confidence. The teacher without question supplied that help and support when it was requested. The initial stimulus came either from the tutor or the student herself. Sometimes the teacher acted as an instructor when the activities were new to the student. More often, she co-operated with the student by making suggestions, listening to accounts, discussing possibilities and team teaching. In the latter stages of the practice the teacher spent much less time in the classroom and S took most of the responsibility but their discussion was evaluative and ranged over general teaching issues as well as specific ones related to that particular classroom.

Classification A teacher/pupil situation leading very quickly to an active and positive collaboration. The tutor

played an important role.

Case study 9 G/T/S/5

Tutor notes: 3

Tutor group: 1

Teacher: diary

Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group

Investigator visits: 3

Stage 1

An initial worry for the student, after preliminary visits was that the class was quite unruly with the teacher and that this would create difficulties for the student. However, he was satisfied that he had established ground rules and the presence of the teacher in the classroom had not inhibited this. The impression received by the investigator on the first visit was of a student who was frustrated by lack of feedback.

"Other members of staff tell him that T is pleased with what S is doing but he would like to hear it from T himself - desperate for feedback. He wanted to show me everything he had done. Would like to discuss the work of specific children with T. No planning together but T is friendly and helpful in supplying materials."

S expressed a low opinion of the advice of the tutor especially about extensive use of the blackboard with a J1 class in which a significant minority had severe difficulties with reading and writing. The tutor had not monitored the preparation of the schemes and never gave attention to anything except the lesson which he watched. Conversely, the tutor took a fairly positive view of the student.

Tutor: "I don't think the class has been properly disciplined in the past. I don't think it has been subjected to systematic routines and therefore I think it is quite a big job for S to do, though I am quite sure he can do it. He is a good lad...a good teacher He's all right, I'm sure he will be all right."

On the other hand he had a low opinion of the teacher. He reported not knowing whether they co-operated and questioned whether co-operation would be a good thing.

Tutor: "...perhaps it might not be a good thing if they do match up quite honestly because they seem to be poles apart."

The teacher had been keeping a diary and commenting, in it, on the student's teaching. In fact he had used the skill sheet as a tool to assess several of the teaching sessions, coming up with analytical and positive evaluations. He had highlighted problems with individual children especially the less able (these latter were the ones who had been worrying the student most, by his account) but he had not discussed these comments with the student. At this point the investigator suggested that some discussion would be welcomed by the student. The investigator's notes read :

"A shy pleasant man - friendly, but with little input into the student's teaching. This is a pity because there are discussion points in the diary which could be raised very

usefully."

Stage 2

The student was now reporting that a considerable amount of praise and reinforcement was coming from the teacher. Particularly there was talk about individuals and the teacher had begun to comment on the work set and the amount of explanation required. The teacher often acted as an assistant to S. The investigator's notes read :

"A friendly supportive relationship with S making the running,"

The only information of tutor input was one set of notes. These were quite detailed in analysing the session but no reference was made to the file or other aspects of the student's teaching either verbally or in writing. The teacher reported that the tutor had now spoken to him to praise the student but he had not passed this praise onto the student because he felt that "you shouldn't praise too much."

Stage 3

S was not interviewed at this stage but T was well pleased with the progress and was maintaining the system as described above. In a written communication to the investigator the tutor reported: "Have chatted with T who is pleased but offers little advice, to me at least. We can simply let S develop". During this stage his visits were curtailed and he did not write any notes for the student.

Comment

Relationships

There was a lack of motivation on the part of the tutor to establish close working relationships within the trio. This was reinforced by the reserved nature of the teacher. However, a very few words of encouragement from the investigator generated an exchange of views between the teacher and the student which was welcomed by both. T believed "a teacher's great priority is to aid a student in his teaching practice" and encouragement along with the use of the skill sheet "made this task much more fruitful". However, there was much less satisfaction in the relationship between teacher and tutor. According to S:

"I had that throughout. My tutor and teacher were nice to each other when they were there but behind each other's backs I had to stick up for them all, "well he means well he's only doing what he thinks""

The comparative input of each will be discussed below.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

The situation described above could have been quite difficult for a weak student. S, once he had established control in the class was quite forthright and self initiating. He was satisfied with his performance and so were the tutor and teacher.

Help and support received by the student

The tutor made quite detailed comments on three teaching sessions. However, in the final student discussion the student reported a lack of respect for the tutor's view. e.g.

S: "Many times I have to bite my tongue.
You don't say that because you'll get a
bad report."

and "The first time he came in he said, "you need
the class to come together more as a class
rather than individual children". This was
the second day I was in. He said "you need
to use the board more in teaching." With the
ability range of the class I thought that was
just ridiculous."

and referring to the suggestion about dictation:

"And I just thought well, tell him he's stupid?
No - so I just said yes I'll try that but I
didn't. I didn't do it but I said I would."

This tutor never made links between one visit and the next
and never referred to the file for information about
lessons taught in between his visits. After the first four
weeks he was satisfied that the student "was all right" and
the rest of his visits were "courtesy calls".

The teacher, initially, played a minimal role but with a
very small amount of encouragement began to give very
welcome positive feedback to the student. He also discussed
individual children and acted as an assistant under the
direction of the student. The student always took the
initiative in these sessions. The student was quite
confident about his teaching and only evaluated within a
comparatively narrow range of criteria. Within that
situation the criteria were always his own established ones
and he had no stimulus to re-think these.

Classification Protagonist

Case Study 10 H/T1/S1/7

Tutor group: 6

Teacher: discussion group

Teacher: skill list

Student: discussion group

Investigator: 2 visits

(the third had to be cancelled)

Stage 1

The initial stage of this practice can best be described from the investigator's notes:

"A bad start! T absent, ill the first week - student didn't know what to do. Main problems: discipline; organisation of groups; setting a programme of work to respond to different speeds of working. The other problem seemed to be that S1 has a completely different style to T1. T1 has now become a model for the student."

and: "General impression of lots and lots of talk, mostly prescriptive e.g. how to run groups; how to keep the classroom tidy; what to give the children to do when they finish early. According to S1 the teacher gives her lots of ideas to try."

The teacher's account of initial difficulties were supported by the accounts of S1 and the tutor. Speaking before T1 returned to school the tutor said:

"I think the girl in the reception class has problems. She is frightened, well she was certainly frightened of me and she was probably frightened of the children as well....I don't think she has a natural manner with them. She was distant with them, although it may be that when she has a class teacher with her the class teacher will help her to relax."

The tutor was very worried but made no attempts to analyse the shortcomings.

Tutor: "She worried me quite a lot did the girl."

I didn't try to pick on her shortcomings
the best I could do was to try and give her
a bit of confidence."

His final solution was to ask a female colleague (an Infant teacher herself) to go in and spend a morning teaching with S1.

Tutor : "...it seemed to me she needed to relax
and she needed somebody to work with her with
the children."

The initial problem was resolved in the way the tutor anticipated when the class teacher returned. It should be noted that the student expressed to the investigator some resentment towards the tutor because he never gave her an opportunity to express her own point of view.

Stage 2

The impression gained from the data at this stage suggested a continuing and even enhanced level of interaction between T1 and S1. Discussion at this stage was particularly about individual children and how they were progressing, e.g. the teacher suggested "closer" explanation because some children were not doing what S had asked them to do. The tutor discussion suggested that the tutor saw his role as monitoring what was going on, particularly checking that

S was receiving support from the teacher.

Tutor: "Two excellent teachers there (he had another student in the same school) supporting the students no end, and getting the best out of the students."

and "I think the teacher has stopped instructing the student now and is very well pleased with the results. She is a very nervous girl is S - you've got to be very careful with her but the teacher is getting the best out of her. She owes a lot to that teacher."

Because the tutor felt the need to "be careful" with S he tended always to offer praise and encouragement. There was other evidence to suggest that the tutor now saw his role as subsidiary e.g. he talked much less to the teacher and spent a shorter time in the school.

Stage 3

This stage brought some upsets. e.g.

Tutor: "This girl was interesting in a way. I thought she had come a long way forward and I and I said I thought I could see a vast difference and the teacher said "yes, but its only today." The last three days she'd gone backI went in on the Thursday and I gather on the Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday she had totally lost her confidence again."

More than once the tutor and the teacher had mentioned that they thought they had an important job of boosting her confidence. At the end of the practice this itself seemed to produce a problem. The student reacted very negatively to a school report which pointed out her shortcomings. From the account of the tutor this led to some quite angry words from the student. He was very disgusted that she appeared "not to appreciate what that teacher has done for her". The student's point of view will be considered below because her comments were part of the post T.P. discussion.

Comment

Relationships

The tutor was impressed with the co-operative teacher/student relationship throughout the practice. However, the student's attitude changed from a positive appreciative account in the early stages to some quite negative accounts at the end. From her account in the final student discussion group it seemed that once the initial problems had been resolved the teacher began "not to have time to discuss planning". She expressed a certain amount of resentment towards the tutor, and to a lesser extent the teacher, particularly because they had allowed her to believe that she was performing satisfactorily.

S was quite a quiet, reserved person and it has already been suggested that she was quite nervous. This encouraged situations where she did not feel that she could express her point of view despite the fact that she did have one. She always felt uneasy with the tutor and this became

resentment by the end of the practice

S: "Well I didn't really find him that useful really."

and "I think it would have been nice to hear what they said to each other....we'd (i.e. herself and the other student in the school) say what did (tutor) think and they'd just sort of say "oh, all right"....that's it. So I never knew what they had said and we never had a chance to get together."

and "Yes because when my tutor came in I said "Is everything all right?" and he said "Yes everything is going fine"and then on my report I see things he has put down as criticisms that I didn't know I was doing, and yet he hadn't pointed them out. If teachers and tutors point them out earlier then you've got time to correct them and there is no need to put them down."

The tutor was full of praise for the two teachers who had students in that school.

Tutor: "...well I've changed my opinion of the school because it is a lot better than I thoughtthe students got a lot more out of it..the students gained an awful lot more than I ever expected them to gain,and I think both the teachers gave an awful lot to the students.

The teachers also were satisfied with their relationship with the tutor primarily because he was prepared to respect their viewpoint and listen to what they had to say.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

The difficulties of this student have already been discussed as well as the progress she made. Some important influencing factors appeared to be her lack of confidence both in her teaching and in her interaction with the other adults in the school situation.

Help and support received by the student

The picture which developed was of a student who required and received a great deal of help of a fairly didactic nature in the early stages of the teaching practice. The help was given by the teacher and the outcomes monitored by the tutor. From the account of S it seemed that once the initial problems had been sorted out the teacher began "not to have time" to discuss planning. This account is reinforced by the teacher's and tutor's suggestion that the student was no longer "being instructed".

The marked differences in personality between T and S have been pointed out and this was the stage when S wanted to experiment with her own ideas but did not have the confidence "in case it went wrong". She also did not have the confidence to impose herself on the teacher.

S: "Well I felt my teacher shot off home at 3.30 I think she would have listened if I had really wanted her to but I just felt that she wasn't really interested....she would never say "what are you going to do tomorrow?""

Similarly when the student wanted to watch how the teacher did things:

S: "I was asked to go out....well I wasn't really asked to go out but she said "well you are free now" so I felt I had better."
and "Quite a few things I didn't do because I wanted to do everything right."

It seemed that once the problems were solved and the student wanted to take some risks, tutor and teacher had decided that their support was not so essential and that they did not define "support" as helping the student to explore.

Classification An initially very effective teacher/pupil relationship which stopped when the student became competent. There was potential for a later protagonist relationship.

Case Study 11 H/T2/S2/7

Tutor group: 6

Teacher: skill sheet

Teacher: discussion group

Teacher: diary

Investigator: 2 visits

(one had to be
cancelled)

Stage 1

Two important factors stood out from the data at this stage, the co-operative nature of the student/teacher relationship and the seriousness with which the teacher took on the role of supervisor. Some examples from the investigator's notes help to illustrate this:

"Lots of talk; very,very regular discussion of "what are you going to do tomorrow?", "have you got everything ready?"; a lot of organisational discussion helping S to notice things that don't seem to have been noticed. T reminds S of things, helps her to notice things and perhaps most importantly gives her ideas. These just seem to develop out of discussion. There were lots of examples of collaboration e.g. S invited to use teacher's "time-fillers", team teaching with Ginn scheme, children use S's Maths scheme and as they finish move onto Ginn maths with the teacher, if S's lessons run on into the teacher's timetabled time S just carries on and the teacher helps her."

Within their discussion the teacher always emphasised that what might be right for one class and one teacher was not necessarily right for another and this seemed to lead to endless discussion, experimentation and joint evaluation. When the Music and Movement lesson went badly for S, T gave a demonstration lesson. The teacher used the skills sheet regularly to evaluate lessons and to help the discussion which followed every lesson. This was always done with the agreement of the student. This picture of co-operation was reinforced by the tutor's accounts. He was overwhelmed by the positive attitude of the teacher.

Tutor: "Well I have never had a class teacher who has spoken to me so much in all the practices I have been on. I thought probably this was the effect of your system on class teachers. Because she was wanting to go on and on and talk about the girl."

and: "The two get on very well and the girl is getting on very well actually. What she has done in a week I thought was extremely good They work together. The two of them would be teaching in the classroom at the same time while I was there."

Stage 2

The co-operation was enhanced so that it had developed into a close personal friendship. The teacher had written analyses of lessons for them both to discuss and this was with the ready agreement of the student. Their talk was described as being "continuous" and about nearly every aspect of class room life. If there had been a change it was to a greater emphasis on discussion of individual

children. There was quite a lot of joint planning, sometimes the teacher taking the initiative and sometimes the student. It was noticeable that although the individuals were interviewed separately each person gave emphasis to the same incidents and events.

The student always showed the teacher any notes the tutor had written and they discussed his comments. The student felt that the tutor "looked for things to pick on" (e.g. crooked lines on the display) and often the student felt that she was not given the opportunity to answer his criticisms. The tutor continued to be full of praise for the student's performance and the teacher's co-operation, but:

Tutor: "I never really let her think she is as good as she is. If I go in there I am always looking for something which is wrong to start a little debate on."

(This was in marked contrast to his behaviour towards the other student in the same school, see case study 10).

The teacher expressed satisfaction with her relationship with the tutor.

Stage 3

Tutor: "Really what is going on is of a very high standard."

and: "I don't know whether these are two exceptions or not (i.e. the two teachers in this school) but over many years I have met many teachers who give nothing back in comparison to these two and I wonder whether just because they are in this scheme they are putting in an extra effort....Oh they are enjoying doing it."

About the student he noticed her ability to discuss and make generalisations.

Tutor: "I think S is always bringing points up from things I've never seen and said....e.g. "If I had done it this way would it have been better" or "this is what I got out of this."

The final praise came when the tutor described how the student had learned how to deal with his idiosyncratic approach.

Tutor: "I know that she has moved a step forward in that because I'm always upon the attack against her, she was now sort of analysing what she was doing in the time that I was in the classroom saying that "well, you might have thought I could have been doing this, but I was doing that". I thought she had really arrived in actual fact. I thought it was very good."

Comment

Relationships

There is no doubt that the significant relationship was that between the student and the teacher. In every way this was a strong, positive, social and professional relationship. However, the pair were very willing to tolerate the presence of the tutor and both worked hard to make him aware of the high standard of teaching which was going on. They saw his role as that of evaluator and as a pair they worked hard to persuade him of their success.

The teacher during the teacher discussion, showed some of the ways in which she had set out to make the student feel at ease, e.g. she had stressed that the class was now the student's; she had given her freedom to experiment even in procedures with which she (the teacher) did not necessarily agree. At the same time it became clear that this particular student met the teacher's own high standards i.e. she showed a very good degree of competence, she was prepared to ask for help, she was likeable.

It was very noticeable that the teacher had high expectations of students and "did not suffer fools gladly". She believed that: students should teach a full timetable; they should not receive too much help; they should show competence and initiative. These demands did not always seem completely compatible with her own behaviour. She was either much more lenient than she said or she had a very great liking and respect for this student.

Strengths and weaknesses

The skill and competence of this student will have become apparent from the fore-going discussion. Over and above this general competence perhaps the characteristics which were respected by the teacher and tutor were: her capacity to question and discuss her own teaching; her willingness to experiment; her capacity "to stand her ground in a discussion"; her ability to generalise from specific incidents to general teaching behaviour and vice versa.

Help and support received by the student

The collaborative relationship was the basis of the support which this student received. There was an attitude of mutual respect between the two. All the planning and teaching was discussed in detail and together they often planned and implemented innovations. The teacher like the student had a critical approach to her teaching and took tremendous pleasure in the discussions which they shared. The tutor recognised the value of this relationship and was more than satisfied to stand back and allow the development to take place. He sometimes acted by taking a provocative stance towards the student to generate justifications but he did not act to generate particular types of teaching behaviours.

Tutor: "...you're out to get the best out of everything you can....they saw themselves as being tested and, by jingo, they were going to succeed."

and "I think it just made life easier because you got a more positive response from the teachers, so it takes that hassle away from supervision."

Classification A firm, effective collaboration.

Case study 12 I/T/S/8

Tutor group: 6 sheets

Tutor: summary sheets

Teacher: skill sheet

Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group

Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

The initial impression in school was of a teacher/student pair in which the teacher was very much the dominant partner. The teacher chose the content for the Maths, Language and Topic and at this stage she was dealing with all the administrative functions in the classroom with the student's teaching restricted to small groups of children. There was a lot of discussion about organisation, when the children should move onto new work and about their behaviour. The teacher believed that the latter was important because it was a large class with some difficult children who were not easy to manage. The teacher monitored all the student's plans but still suggested that she was willing for the student to do anything which she wanted to do with the children (the example she gave was allowing the student to seat the children on chairs for a story instead of on the floor). The teacher was pleased that the tutor had spent time talking to her.

The tutor referred to the class as very noisy and untidy. However, she liked the class teacher and felt very comfortable in the classroom joining in with the children and in her discussion with the teacher and the student. She expressed some concern about the small amount of responsibility which was being allowed the student.

Tutor: "I got to know the teacher as a person. She's a very, very nice person and she's very open, very honest....She'll talk about her way of doing things, appreciating that it isn't our way of doing things. Actually, when she speaks to the children she is harsh and she does shout but on the other hand the children know her and they sort of take it from her. She does have the effect of being able to keep them under control but it is a very, very noisy classShe was the one who was in overall charge, that was evident....It was the sort of situation where I felt so welcome I was able to join in as well and I got on a lot better there because I simply moved round and talked to the children about what they were doing."

Stage 2

By this time the student was taking responsibility for most of the class. According to the tutor she was "operating like the class teacher". Particularly the tutor noted that she was shouting a lot without having the relationship with the children which the class teacher had developed. It was clear from discussion with the teacher and student that the teacher was still exerting a strong influence on what was taught and when it was taught. e.g. she told me that the student had not yet "got onto Maths

this morning" so she intended to tell S to do it in the afternoon. This influence was related particularly to organisational matters and content. The teacher still spent all the time in the classroom with the student whether she was teaching or not. The teacher again spoke very warmly about her professional relationship with the tutor but the student expressed some resentment of the fact that T and the tutor had not allowed her to read to the children the story which she had chosen. The tutor at this stage was concerned about the excessive noise level. The response of the teacher to the tutor's concern was that the student needed "to clamp down quickly", the response of the student was that that was the customary noise level which was permitted as long as the children were busy. The tutor believed that the indiscipline was caused by the inappropriateness of the tasks set for the children. In order that the student might recognise this she asked her to make up a skill track of the work to be covered and to prepare individual records of the children's progress. The tutor also made this written entry on the summary sheets: "Teacher tired and losing patience quickly - shouting at children unreasonably. Student stands bemused. Has decided this is the norm and she can't do anything about it." Throughout the tutor discussion during stages 1 and 2, it was noticeable that the tutor spent a great deal more time talking about another student she was supervising (see case study 14) than about this one. The teacher expressed the view that "there is still a long way to go", i.e. in organising groups, keeping track of what individuals might be doing, and continuous provision for the children.

Stage 3

Towards the end of the practice the slight dissatisfaction expressed by teacher and tutor became criticism. The student had conscientiously prepared the records but it had not made any difference to her provision for the children. Rather it meant that she had less time for her planning. Both teacher and tutor referred to her lack of use of resources, her dependence on work cards and banda sheets, her lack of stimulating ideas and lack of use of the college Resource Centre. The investigator's notes at this stage say:

"Both teacher and headteacher are very disappointed that S is sticking to workbooks and she is actually dependent on the workcards that the teacher has made. She is using very little of her own material and this is a complaint which they have. They are disappointed because they think she is taking the easy way out."

The tutor agreed with this analysis and went on to express surprise that the teacher was "letting her get away with it". In other words she saw it as the responsibility of the teacher not to let her "get away with it." The teacher's view was that the student had received a lot of advice which she had not followed. (The student's opinion of this will be considered below because it was only voiced in the student's final discussion.)

The teacher still expressed satisfaction with her working relationship with the tutor using phrases like "very professionally satisfying", "both on the same wave length". She referred to a number of areas of agreement e.g. use of workcards, the need for S to move round the class more, need for a greater use of support material. However, she criticised the time spent on extensive records, apparently without realising that it represented an area of disagreement with the tutor. The teacher also reported that she had asked S to change her topic from "weather" to "caring" and that it was another student in the same school who had helped S prepare the material for this.

Comment

Relationships

The teacher throughout was delighted with the professional relationship which she felt she had with the tutor. In the early stages the tutor was also optimistic about the trio discussion. Later her concern about the general level of provision in that classroom caused an anxiety which affected her positive attitude to the school and the teacher. About the class teacher the student said:

S: "I found her very helpful, she made some very helpful comments and she was very approachable."

She also found her to be always available, but:
"...in fact, too readily available. She was there too much some of the time. I think it would have been nicer if she had left me on my own."

The impression gained was that the teacher was a dominating partner, possibly "suffocating". The student felt a lack of control over what was going on:

S: "She kept on whisking the kids out of the lessons all the time. I didn't know where half of them were. She was in the classroom with them but they were moving backwards and forwards and you would never know whether they were with her or with you."

In response to a question from another student i.e. "Did she not tell you the day before?" she said:

S: "I never used to know who was disappearing. They just used to disappear. It was always the weakest ones that I wanted to work on - never the ones that could do it anyway."

Perhaps surprisingly, the student did not express resentment at this assault on her autonomy, she seemed to treat it with resigned acceptance.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

It was the opinion of T and the tutor that this student showed a number of weaknesses in her teaching and some of these have been described above. An important factor seemed to be a lack of a sense of purpose which could have been either a characteristic of the student herself or of the

situation in which she was placed. She appeared to be willing to do what was directly required of her providing she understood what that was. She was criticised for lack of initiative especially by the tutor who pointed out that she never took the opportunity to raise points in discussion. In the opinion of S her ideas were not always valued by the other participants (e.g. the choice of a story). S very often referred to the nature of the children in the class to justify her difficulties.

Help and support received by the student

Both teacher and tutor felt that the student had received a lot of advice and help (as reported above), but had not taken advantage of the help or been prepared to put in the necessary amount of work. The student presented a different viewpoint. She had done what she understood to be required of her (e.g. she spent a great deal of time preparing child studies required by the tutor; she followed all the instructions to do with organisation and content given her by the class teacher). The problem for the student seemed to arise out of the trio discussion. In the course of this discussion numerous issues of professional interest arose but the student was not able to pick out the relevant points and hence what was expected of her. There was too much for her to remember and she was never given any notes to which she could refer later. She found it quite difficult to organise her thinking during these sessions when she had to teach immediately afterwards. Sometimes the actual requirements made of her were difficult to relate to her teaching (e.g. the child studies which she conscientiously prepared but could not apply to her teaching in the way the tutor wanted). In fact, the student was not even clear why these records were required. According to the tutor she should plan Maths work on the basis of the children's needs and interests but according to the teacher the children had to move sequentially through the Maths scheme.

The tutor accepted that the student was modelling herself on the class teacher but still introduced her own comments. The student was very uncertain about how to operationalise with the children the requests made by the tutor:

S: "I think it would be nice for the tutor to spend more time getting to know the children in the class, because I was only just beginning to get to know them really by the end of the practice - and it must be really difficult for the tutor to judge you and the children when they don't know the children."

and: "I think especially with a lot of things she said I couldn't see them working myself - till you actually see the tutor doing it - see it working."

She also found the tutor very critical. The tutor herself referred to the need to show how to do things but although she talked to the children while S was teaching she never took control of the class herself as a means of demonstration. The tutor was not consistent in her

judgement of this student. Initially, she believed that S knew "exactly where she was going wrong". By the end of the practice she was saying with equal conviction that S "did not seem to realise that action was necessary". She did not appear to recognise that she had changed her judgements and it is possible that if her action with the student was based on these judgements it could have been confusing for the student. Perhaps the final comment of the tutor is significant:

Tutor: "...everything she is doing in that class room is better than what was going on before."

Classification A weak student who was receiving conflicting messages about what she should be doing. At the same time there was little help available about how to operationalise suggested approaches. There seemed to be potential for a consistent teacher/pupil approach.

Case study 13 J/T/S/4

Tutor: notes
Tutor group: 5
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: skill list
Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

All the accounts highlighted the easy, warm, friendly relationships between the participants. When the investigator visited the school there was an immediate request from the teacher that following on from this project there should be an established relationship between a particular tutor and a school and that they would be very happy with tutor 4. There was an equally positive relationship between the teacher and the student. The investigator's notes read :

"Impression of a great sense of trust between the two (i.e. T and S). S can try things out knowing that T will be round the corner if anything goes wrong. T is very helpful. S watches T teach and sometimes joins in with him, as he does with her if she wants him to."

T believed that the student should have a chance to try things out and then find out how they might go wrong. According to S a lesson which the tutor had watched could have been chaotic if the tutor had not been able to join in and help. She was confident that the teacher would have joined in in the same way if the tutor had not been there, although he would not have monitored the plan in the first place.

The talk between T and S was spontaneous and informal, perhaps about children's behaviour or work and whether "everything is going all right", but did not become an analysis of the lesson. The teacher did not read the file and did not request information about what the student was going to teach. He allowed her always to take the initiative, but was always prepared to listen and offer advice if it was requested. The class was in an open plan area so that the teacher was nearly always near the class without interfering. The atmosphere was relaxed and cheerful. This impression was reinforced by the tutor's comments, see tutor summary sheet:

"Both in the same mould (i.e. attitude to children and teaching) - get them interested, keep behaviour at acceptable levels, don't over-push, don't push to the limits, - share the same sensitivity to children"

The tutor welcomed their "quiet collaboration" but felt a need to stimulate them into professional discussion even if it was not made essential by some crisis.

Tutor: "They've been quietly collaborating. I have to prod T into making suggestions which he then does - useful ones."

and: "I prompted him this morning saying (to T)
"I noticed this, what do you think about it ?"
Then he would say "yes, you really need quick short bursts of this" and then he would come

in with things but you have to prod him."

The tutor's T.P. notes were wide ranging and detailed, praising a number of aspects and setting targets for the week.

Stage 2

There was a lull in the interaction between S and T during this stage. The investigator's read :

"Discussion is falling off now - one reason that both were ill last week - the other that it doesn't (in their eyes) seem to be necessary now. T doesn't look at the file and only sometimes asks what is going on. However, he is in the area a lot of the time and does see what is going on and is satisfied. They are clearly sympathetic with each other's approach (e.g. their discussion on little innovatory ideas for the topic.)"

There was discussion about P.E. because T had to watch that to comply with safety requirements and S still benefited from watching T, especially in P.E. and his use of Language/Maths games.

The tutor's notes were still wide ranging and detailed. She made detailed reference to what the children were learning during the topic sessions and this made an impression on S because she highlighted it during her interview with the investigator. She began to take steps to make the work more purposeful.

Stage 3

During this stage there was a renewed increase in the teacher/student discussion, stimulated by the tutor. During the early part of this stage the tutor reported on the summary sheet: "T does join us in a trio, dragged in by myself!" but then went on to report:

"However T, S, and myself spent time discussing how to introduce the theme of "holidays". T was full of super ideas - all sorts of things were sparked off - decisions were made about display for the Hall and Assembly, for the pierhead etc. To find more resources."

The democratic nature of the discussion was perhaps illustrated by the fact that the tutor wanted S to take a Science topic but T and S argued successfully for holidays without any Science emphasis. This sort of trio discussion was continued in subsequent weeks as well as disagreements being aired: see tutor summary sheet:

"Much discussion as to if S had achieved her aims - BUT disagreement as to usefulness of worksheet of questions as follow - up. I wanted to push for a range of activities, T thought worksheet was fine."

The tutor discussion group suggested a certain dilemma for the tutor in this collaboration:

Tutor: "What I would really like to work on is to get her to work harder and to think things through thoroughly, and she has not done that and T always covered over for her.....so I've not had that sort of extra strength I would have liked - which is a pity."

At one stage she even described the most satisfying

situation for a tutor as being one where the teacher is unsympathetic and leaves tutor and student to get on and "really achieve something with the children" without hindrance. However, she was extremely careful always to include both teacher and student in the discussion in school if at all possible. The reports from the teacher suggest that he was sympathetic to the tutor's expectations and felt that his practical input about the children was useful.

Comment

Relationships

The data suggested that the relationship between all the participants was warm, friendly and co-operative. The reports of the tutor were supported by very positive accounts from teacher and student:

- S: "Yes I think it was one of the most helpful things (i.e. tutor and teacher working together with the student). It wasn't me and the tutor and me and the teacher. It was the 3 of us together and I never had one occasion when, for example, the tutor said "why don't you do this?" and the teacher said "oh do this"you know where they disagreed. We just discussed it as a three."
- T: "I've been involved with (tutor) - um - she's probably about the only tutor I think I have met where the three of us have actually sat down. I've had tutors who have talked about this poor old student who is standing right beside you and being totally ignored....yes, but I think that helped because the student then knows both what (tutor) wants and what I want.... and usually we've come to an understanding and that way she probably feels confident to go ahead and do it."

The teacher also discussed his responsibility in helping the student feel comfortable in the school:

- T: "I think we have to put them at their ease because they are going into a school they have never seen before, they are going to a teacher they have not met before and they can be very nervous."

The student's account illustrated his success:

- S: "Mine was very helpful like that but he wouldn't ask me questions. He wouldn't say "how do you think that went?"....it was just if I wanted to ask him, otherwise he wasn't going to question me about what I was doing. So if I wanted his advice I could go to him but he wasn't there at the end of the lesson saying I think you should have done this or that."

Student's strength and weaknesses

This student had had a rather unsuccessful first teaching practice but from the start of this one she showed a

positive and competent approach to her teaching :

Tutor: "...but S is dynamic and outgoing."

and: "I don't know how she managed so badly on the other teaching practice, because she really is super with the children."

The tutor saw her as belonging to a particular type of teacher and, in fact, a type to which the teacher also belonged:

Tutor: "They rely on this charismatic approach and the children relate to them well. They don't have any discipline problems....so they don't NEED to talk!! why bother? there is nothing to talk about is there ?"

This last report illustrates a niggling concern of the tutor's that the student was not very reflective and would only "do enough". By the end of the practice she was more satisfied.

Help and support received by the student

The tutor's notes were notable for their range and detail. From the records it was clear that she spent a lot of time in school and in discussion with T and S. She was particularly skilful at involving the teacher in discussions which he did not really seem to feel were his responsibility. As a result S benefited from some of his very good ideas and his knowledge of the children (which she would not have done without this stimulus from the tutor). The accounts from the student illustrate that she did take seriously the points which the tutor raised even if she did not always implement all of them. She came to have a quite mature understanding of her own capability at that particular time and respected the tutor for not trying to make her (i.e. student) into "a mirror image of herself" Initially, the tutor was frustrated at what she felt was her lack of impact on the student and the feeling that the necessary co-operation with the teacher might have "watered down" her influence. However, she was satisfied at the end that the student had reached a level of competence and reflection which was right for her at that time.

Tutor: "I thought about whether I could have pushed her, pushed her and T away from being mutual collaborators getting away with the minimum ...in a nice sort of way....I think I did a little bit by getting T to suggest things more frequently that might involve the children in active learning.... Having said that he was so reluctant to make suggestions and so sympathetic of the student that I am sure that if I had pushed very hard he would have seen me as the ogre tutor and pushed me out completely....I think she has come out of this practice much better than the first, with much more confidence."

Classification A potentially passive collaboration which was greatly enhanced by the efforts of the tutor, who managed not to be excluded.

Case study 14 K/T/S/8

Tutor group: 6

Student: discussion group

Tutor: summary sheets

Investigator: 3 visits

Tutor group :6

Teacher: diary

Teacher: skill sheet

Teacher: discussion group

Stage 1

There was every indication that S made a poor start :

Tutor: "...there were an awful lot of things
going wrong in that room. The student was doing
all kinds of things that you were actually
itching to tell her about....I only
got through half the things I wanted to say."
and "It was the sort of situation that I found it
very difficult - apart from sitting on my
hands, to sit and watch and not do anything
about."

This account was re-iterated in the teacher's diary and verbal account. She referred to the bad behaviour of the children, the use of the student's voice and that S needed to be more assertive. The accounts also made clear other uncertainties of tutor and teacher. The tutor felt very uncomfortable in the school and also felt that she had behaved inappropriately on her first visit.

Tutor: "I sort of barged in too early and wanted to say all these things to the student. Now the teacher was sitting very quietly in another open plan area looking through and I hadn't realised that she knew exactly what was going on....but only when I was talking to the teacher and she opened the nice, neat little diary that she is keeping for you and I realised she was aware of everything."

Then the tutor described how she tried to intervene when things became very chaotic only to find that she caused more disturbance because she was not familiar with the rules which were governing the children's behaviour.

It was true that T had a detailed account of the problems S was facing and creating but she had not discussed these with S because at that stage she did not see that as part of her role. She did not even ask the student what she was planning to do with the children. The investigator's notes read:

"...but goes on to say that she doesn't ask S for plans, doesn't talk much about the children or the children's work. It seems as if the teacher doesn't like to ask but she does sneak a look at the student's file in order to see what she should do with the children that the student hasn't covered."

This was quite typical of all her behaviour in the early stages. She was clearly distressed by what was going on in the classroom, was unwilling to intervene in case she upset the student but equally unwilling to see the children completely wasting time. She solved the problem for herself by sometimes "helping" S give work out (so ensuring that

children were provided for) or by catching in the resource area (where she was sitting) any children she felt were wasting time and checking that they were doing what they should be doing. This was all done in a very surreptitious way in order "not to undermine the confidence of the student".

The tutor in her efforts not to make any more mistakes by asking children to do things which they were not supposed to do, made several attempts to get the teacher to state the rules of the classroom. In her attempts to be accommodating the teacher always replied by saying that the student should feel free to do what she thought was best and she, the teacher would try not to interfere. See the investigator's notes:

"T rather reluctantly admitted to some helping out here e.g. giving out cards. It sounded as if she had rules she wanted to keep but didn't want to impose them."

This also led to a rather frustrating argument between teacher and tutor about whether spelling mistakes should be rubbed out or crossed out.

In the face of all the problems the teacher felt she would have to help out by: "stopping S from being too nice"; "encouraging her to use her voice better"; "encouraging her to be more assertive."

Stage 2

The visits of tutor and investigator acted as a spur to the teacher to take a more active part in the T.P. The relationship between T and S became much less formal and there was discussion about what she was going to do, with the teacher offering ideas about specific sessions (e.g. using ice in Science) and about the progress of work (e.g. the brighter children being ready to move off their study of weight). However, the initiative was always allocated to the student with the teacher being ready to adapt.

The recognition of the need to co-operate came for the teacher and tutor at the end of a particularly disastrous P.E. lesson:

Tutor: "...right from the start I couldn't put that relationship (i.e. between teacher and student) into any of your categories at all and I couldn't make out why, but this last time only on Friday afternoon this week, the teacher suddenly came out with something which explained it in a sense... um... when I sort of jumped on her for help because I simply didn't know how to start to put right a most disastrous PE lesson...so I sort of said "what can you do? what can WE do?" putting it in those kinds of terms and she suddenly said "I've had students before but nobody has ever before asked me to be involved in this kind of way."

This actually led to a trio discussion when certain things were stated plainly to the student, some targets set and some specific suggestions made. At the same time the discussion clarified other points, e.g. the criticism by

the tutor of the fact that in a 30 minute session the children were actually moving for about 5 minutes was explained by the teacher who had told the student she must wait for everyone to listen before speaking.

Stage 3

Up to this point the tutor had to a certain extent been working on the assumption that the student was not aware of her weaknesses and that the role of the tutor was to point them out. At this stage the tutor began to spell out actions which could be taken. The teacher was also increasing her input. She began to present model lessons for S. At first she did this without making it explicit to the student (i.e. just hoping that she would notice) but later she began to give some quite explicit instructions especially for sessions of P.E. and Movement where weaknesses in control and management were serious. The tutor was pressing the student to spend more time on preparation believing that this was a cause of some of her difficulties. In fact, the student was already planning in minute detail and the teacher was aware of this. The teacher's suggestion (offered to the investigator not the tutor) was that the student needed to act quickly and spend less time thinking about what she was doing or, in other words greatly simplify her planning. The teacher emphasised the need for assertiveness, control and specific training in use of voice, whereas the tutor tended to look for a more careful and extended choice of tasks to meet the needs of the children as well as exciting story books to interest them.

The teacher was, in fact, full of praise for the imaginative ideas of S but very worried because she believed the children were being over stimulated by this wide range of new and unusual activities in a way which exacerbated the control problems. She would have liked a narrower focus in the activities. All of this she discussed with the investigator but was not prepared to try to influence the tutor conduct of the practice. She believed that the student was being responsive to all her advice but still the control and discipline was not as good as it should be, although there was some progress. The tutor on the other hand reported that the student had not tried out her suggestions.

Comment

Relationships

The student was a quiet, friendly, willing person and she made a strong positive relationship with the class teacher:

S: "...the teacher was really understanding
and I think she is good at assessing my
personality as well because she gauged when
to ask me and she suggested things as well.
and kept saying we are all still learning
and you can't do everything at once."

Her relationship with the tutor was fairly amicable and she reported getting help from both teacher and tutor but that

the tutor's advice "did not always work for me". She also found the tutor more critical "was glad my teacher was the other way because it balanced out". She felt that "they both have my interests at heart" and the occasional trio discussions meant that information did not have to be repeated:

S: "...we got the same information at the same time rather than recounting it back."

The difficulty the teacher had in accepting a role of joint supervision has been described. Eventually, she played a very active but quiet role with the student but very rarely elaborated on her own point of view to the tutor.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

There was a general consensus that S was a weak student and her weaknesses have been described. Throughout the practice the teacher saw the weakness as a lack of control and assertiveness exacerbated by the range of stimulating experiences which the student produced for the children but which she could not monitor. The tutor saw the weakness, initially and for most of the practice as the student's lack of recognition of and insight into her own problems. The tutor changed her view completely in the final discussion:

Tutor: "S has known what she should do not only towards the end of this practice but probably towards the middle of her first T.P. S knew exactly what she should do. She's not doing it and has admitted to me this morning that she still isn't but she could have written her own report."

Help and support received by the student

The confusion in the teacher's mind about her role and in the tutor's mind about her assessment of S was bound to have an impact upon the help which S received. She was a weak student and by the end of the practice she was getting the systematic help which seemed to be of most use to her. The teacher's relationship with her was one of sensitive support. She worked hard not to dampen the confidence of S but it was only in the second half of the practice that she worked systematically to help S to develop skills. The relationship between the teacher and the tutor also took time to develop. In the second half of the practice each recognised that they both could and should contribute. However, there were still differences of opinion which could not be resolved because they were not made explicit. The teacher began to recognise some agreement between her judgements and those of the tutor although there had been times when she felt that the tutor was making an issue out of irrelevances at a time when the student's difficulties were intense.

Classification Eventually this became a teacher/pupil relationship which helped the student to develop some important teaching skills.

Case study 15 L/T/S/9

Tutor group: 6

Tutor: summary sheets

Teacher: skill sheet

Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group

Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

The best description of the atmosphere in this school comes from the tutor discussion group:

Tutor: "Any way as soon as I got in I was enveloped in this lovely warm friendly atmosphere. They were super to me and it is quite evident that the class teacher and S had an extremely good relationship. The class teacher is, I think, very sensible about S's shortcomingsvery, very supportive and she was doing lovely things like checking up on individual children at the end of the afternoon like "how did so-and-so get on?" and "now are you all right for Monday morning?" and making sure S felt good about what she wanted to do even though in some ways S may have bitten off more than she can chew (i.e. introducing complex group work). T said to me that she had said to S that she would teach a lesson to show her how you actually started off five groups doing different things."

Everything in this account was supported by the separate reports from teacher, student and investigator. The teacher did not habitually plan with S but always checked up "to see if she was all right". If S made a particular request or suggestion, e.g. a wish to implement group work, then the teacher immediately gave it her attention. It was clear that the teacher enjoyed discussion and enjoyed discussion with S and the tutor, joining in very easily when student and tutor were talking together (e.g. about the rather poor results of a creative writing lesson). Most of the conversation between S and T came after a lesson and was about the children's behaviour. The tutor reported that her focus in the initial stages was "picking up vibes in the school".

Stage 2

The supportive atmosphere was still apparent at this time. The student felt very comfortable in the school and the class and was prepared to take the initiative in trying out different practices. The group system was working well and, in fact, in a more varied way than the teacher usually used. The tutor picked up the independent attitude of the student quite early on at this stage:

Tutor: "But it amused me that from this situation where basically S does everything in deference to T, there are points where she will quite definitely go her own way."

Other examples from the reports of the participants suggested the teacher's willingness for S to experiment even when she, T, did not agree with that approach.

However, despite this warm "enabling" (the word used by the tutor) there was a definite decrease in discussion. The investigator's notes read:

"In some ways this is disappointing in the sense that consultation has dropped off. This is because S is now seen as competent. In fact, she can run the group system in a more varied way than T. They discuss, on a Monday morning what S is going to do during the week, so that T can fill in her record book. T usually just agrees with S's plans but after something has been done e.g. too much creative writing in the Topic so teacher suggests a factual sheet for the children to complete."

The teacher was always aware of what was going on and she monitored the use of the reading books and S.P.M.G. Maths scheme. There was also still a little discussion about the background and behaviour of the children. The student's discussion with the tutor was also becoming very limited in that she, the tutor, usually left before the end of the session.

Stage 3

The situation outlined above continued into this stage. The investigator's notes read:

"Not a great deal of discussion now. T still sees weekly plans and would comment if necessary. S does not ask for advice except occasionally about the very slow children with whom she doesn't think she has succeeded. She is most pleased with the relationship with the class and the improvement she can see. The teacher's duties as deputy head may be influencing the time she feels she has available."

The relaxed non threatening atmosphere in the school could be illustrated by the student's account of a school trip which she planned. She described this, rather melodramatically, as "a disaster" but not so the staff. Although they were all sorry about some of the opportunities missed the staff as a whole were prepared to see this in the most positive light. (This was an atmosphere in marked contrast to that found in other schools visited.) The tutor's summary sheets were very brief at this time and she suggested that it was quite difficult to find things on which to comment so that she relied heavily on the student raising discussion points (i.e. when the tutor was able to stay for discussion.):

Tutor: "So with S I tend to wait because I know she is thinking and I am almost certain she will have something to say or to ask me about. Sometimes its a very specific thing, something has actually happened and she will want my reaction and at other times its a much more general professional issue. I actually said this morning "I am glad, I have found something I can nail you on." I very rarely have anything I can kick at." (this was a problem with setting some subtraction problems).

During the discussion at this stage the tutor explained her feelings about the role of the teacher and its relationship

with that of the tutor:

Tutor: "That's made me think of something actually, which I feel a bit embarrassed about in a way, the construction I realise I have about what teaching practice is about in this respect, and that is that my student will have a, in this sense, competent and supportive, self examining class teacher not only because it takes the heat off me - because it does- but also I think that's where the student's greatest help comes from."

In fact the tutor was making very short visits at this time and very little written or spoken comment on the teaching.

Comment

Relationships

The very warm, friendly, supportive atmosphere in this school has already been referred to. It was experienced by tutor and student. The teacher commented on the pleasure she took in talking to the tutor and in having a student in her class. She quickly joined in any student/tutor discussion in school when it took place. The student, while in no way reporting a negative attitude to the tutor, felt that she never got to know her at all well and that this made any discussion with her uneasy. She also commented on the fact that the commitments of the tutor seemed to make it impossible for her to spend much time in school. These factors made an easy natural trio discussion difficult:

S: "I felt embarrassed at first...because I was more friendly with T really and...um... and she used always to ask what the tutor and everything and I couldn't really say the same things in the front of the two of them."

Student's strengths and weaknesses

This student had had a rather unsuccessful first Teaching Practice and this was known by the tutor and the school. However, her competence in this practice was praised by all the participants. Particularly she showed a sense of purpose and independence in her thinking as well as skill in the classroom.

Tutor: "...but I think that by the end of the practice S was doing better than the class teacher....was doing more interesting things and getting a better response from the childrenand the class teacher, who was such a generous person, was pleased."

Help and support received by the student

At one stage the tutor referred to this school as having an "enabling" environment. In the early stages S received considerable amount of advice as well as support and a model. The student felt quite free to reject that advice or accept and apply it as she felt fit. Later she received much less advice but still support and friendly tolerance of her innovations. The tutor after the very early stages

acted as a monitor to check that all was well and become familiar with the student's progress.

S: "No, I never got any feedback - I only had one proper discussion with my tutor, because she used to come in in the middle of the lesson and just leave a few scribbly notes - so I never talked to her until half term....she just had no time at all to spare for me."

The tutor made judgements about the best use of her time in the light of her judgements of S's competency. The teacher also made a judgement that S was thoroughly competent and so gave her attention to the responsibilities as deputy head teacher.

In fact, S had introduced a number of innovations into that classroom some of which the tutor and even T were not aware. She had a very reflective attitude to her teaching and a strong sense of her future aspirations as a teacher. She would have welcomed the opportunity to discuss these and it could be argued that, professionally, she needed that opportunity.

The tutor in this school was the one who, when she reflected on her own practice, decided that she looked for a rather high level of competence with which she could feel satisfied and then left to the student the further responsibility especially if her, the tutor's, energies were required elsewhere.

Classification There was a teacher/pupil relationship in the very early stages which, quickly, became a warm, supportive protagonist relationship. This latter could have been developed much further, professionally.

Case study 16 M/T/S/10

Tutor: notes

Investigator: 3 visits

Tutor group: 5

Tutor: summary sheets

Teacher: skill sheet

Teacher: discussion group

Stage 1

This school was quite prescriptive in its expectations it had of the student. A list of requirements had been drawn up to help the students prepare. The curriculum content and classroom organisation was set out in advance and the teacher stayed in the classroom with the student for the first week as instructed by the head teacher. There was a marked contrast in personality between T and S as noted by the tutor and the investigator (and later commented on by the teacher).

Tutor: "Well again, I went along and S was busy teaching and T was sitting watching him and T shot off as I arrived and left him going on his own. They seem two very different sorts of personality. S is quiet and methodical and gets on with the job and T is vivacious....He seemed very well organised from what I could see - very methodical and didn't get flustered."

The teacher reported having to "bite her tongue not to say anything" during the first week, although there had been a little discussion about the use of slides for teaching and introducing new vocabulary. There was no discussion about planning (except about organisational matters concerned with who would be teaching and when) and no systematic joint evaluation. The teacher seemed almost surprised at the idea of discussion of this type. The tutor's TP notes followed the progress of each lesson he viewed offering positive feedback (e.g. "an orderly lesson", "good use of the blackboard"). There was a sprinkling of remarks suggesting action (e.g. "early finishers can be a problem", "was the language on the workcards appropriate?"). The tutor was a Science specialist and there was one trio discussion about Science and problem solving when the tutor was able to recommend some resource material to the teacher. The tutor showed that he had read the student's lesson plans by signing each one.

Stage 2

During this stage there was a definite decrease not only in the small amount of discussion but in teacher/student interaction generally. The investigator's notes read:

"The policy of the school is quite definite. T now has her new timetable, i.e. some sessions taking language in her own class, the rest working in other classes (i.e. Science with the Infants). There is very little discussion of planning and conduct of lessons - some discussion of children's work and behaviour."

During this interview the teacher questioned the investigator closely about her opinion of what the teacher could/should be doing. This discussion involved the student

as well and a number of interesting issues were raised about such classroom matters as the organisation of children's groups. It became apparent that S had started off organising the groups in one way and gradually altered the organisation to a way much more similar to that used by the class teacher. Neither T nor S had known anything about each other's working until this discussion which then moved onto the use of workcards.

The tutor's supervision behaviour during this time was similar to that described in stage 1. The only difficulty was that because the teacher was always teaching elsewhere he was not able to talk to her:

Tutor: "It seems that S is identified as a good student and therefore he can carry on on his own."

The head teacher spent one session with the student and made extensive notes on his performance. She was worried about his tendency to blame the children rather than his own teaching for their lack of understanding.

Stage 3

This case study does not fall easily into the three stages employed. The issue to be described was apparent but unrecognised in stage 2. The school began to be very worried that S would "not talk" to them. This anxiety about the extremely reserved nature of the student and the feeling of the teacher that she should be making a larger contribution (teacher report) worked together to produce a change in the working relationship between S and T. The student began to refer to the opinion of the teacher in his lesson evaluations and there was more discussion between the two as well as with the tutor. Despite this increasing interaction, the tutor reported that S was still unwilling to raise any issues for discussion himself:

Tutor (referring to the growing of crystals)

"I would wait light years for him to raise anything - like the Science - he was growing stalactites and it would never have worked the way he was doing it. He wouldn't have raised it with me. He wouldn't have said to me "that's going wrong, or its not working.""

Comment

Relationships

It would be quite inaccurate to imply that the relationships in this school were not positive and supportive. However, the commitments of the teacher and the very reserved nature of the student made interaction difficult. In the final teacher discussion T described her difficulties:

T: "...he wouldn't speak. We started off about the first week or fortnight and it was fine and we talked about things and then when I sort of left the classroom (i.e. when she was timetabled elsewhere) he wouldn't speak - and I would give him a lift in the morning

and a lift home at night and he just wouldn't open his mouth and I was getting neurotic about it. I was so tired of trying to talk to him. I was afraid I was intimidating him....I must admit that since, he has been a bit more talkative but its still quite a trial to get him to speak."

She wondered about their different personality characteristics and the influence they might have had:

T: "I mean I'm quite loud in the classroom and he's very, very quiet....I've probably frightened him to death really."

The tutor in the early stages of the practice was able to participate in trio discussion because of his Science specialism (which was also the interest of the teacher) but later the teacher was not available because she was teaching elsewhere.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

The student showed himself capable of managing, competently, a highly complex group work system. However, tutor and teacher had certain different reservations about him. The teacher saw him lacking in confidence and enthusiasm with a tendency to blame the children for their lack of understanding rather than his own lack of flexibility. The tutor did not agree with this criticism which could be accounted for by S's markedly reserved demeanour. The tutor, however, referred to him as a "chameleon teacher" i.e. one who was all too ready to take on the requirements made of him in any class without developing a style particularly his own.

Help and support received by the student

In their preparation for student placements this school had a very responsible attitude. Their expectations were made quite clear and the student's performance carefully monitored in the early stages. Having satisfied themselves of a student's competence the class teacher was re-deployed elsewhere. However, she took it upon herself to watch and evaluate one session as well as monitoring the student's file. In this case the teacher commitments and the reserve of the student led to a breakdown in communication. The tutor was also satisfied with the student's competence but still offered regular if limited feedback. He also tried to encourage the student to experiment a bit more (e.g. he sometimes raised questions "why was this week's lesson better than last weeks?").

Tutor: "I think the time is now for him to explore what he can do - stretch himself - be adventurous - as full of flair as he can be. He's got a good grip of the class and the children are certainly not at risk."

However, he was not specific in his requests. It is tempting to speculate that the teacher could have had a role here. She was lively and very willing to join in discussion when she had eventually begun to appreciate the role she could play. However, the whole process was

hampered by the school procedures, the expectations of the teacher and the reserve of the student.

Classification The teacher tended to have just a monitoring role. There was clear evidence of the potential for an effective protagonist relationship.

Case study 17 N/T/S/11

Tutor: notes
Tutor group: 5
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: diary
Teacher: skill sheet
Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

The initial situation in the school was very welcoming and friendly for all the visitors. However, there was considerable pressure on the student because she was unaware until the last moment what requirements were to be made of her, i.e. timetable, curriculum content, grouping of the children, and how her responsibilities would relate to those of the teacher. She had responded to this by preparing for all eventualities - as she said "I am the sort of person who needs to be well prepared". The timetable was not specified even in the first week but this uncertainty, in fact, led to "lots of discussion about everything". The student and teacher were very comfortable in each others company and were already planning and teaching together like two colleagues, adapting their teaching and planning to meet the needs of the moment. The teacher was anxious to know whether his input was what was expected of him.

The tutor was very impressed with the high level of co-operation between T and S in this school. They were equally pleased with their relationship with him. His notes were full of praise for the student and particularly reassurance that the student's approach was appropriate:

Tutor's TP notes: "There was a great deal of practical problem solving going on which is GREAT. With this type of lesson the process is always of far greater importance than the product."

Stage 2

The potential for co-operation described above was enhanced in the second stage, see investigator's notes:

"A really pleasant visit....Their whole day is spent in joint work, i.e. teaching and talking. T says he has never had a student with whom he has been able to work so productively in this way. Each day runs in an entirely flexible way, i.e. it changes endlessly. There seems to be an endless supply of useful ideas to develop - continual flexibility to meet the requirements of the moment."

The subsequent notes describe in detail the manner of consultation and team teaching in different areas of the curriculum.

The student was full of praise for the extent of her learning from T. Most of his advice was to do with "the hurly-burly of classroom life", e.g. how to use the guillotine, how to put up a display quickly, how to adapt a plan to new circumstances. The tutor was very impressed with the degree of collaboration.

Tutor: "With T and S you've got two people with

a fairly large class of quite difficult children. They genuinely do collaborate and work side by side and plan a great deal together. The interesting thing is the way they are both very supportive towards each other and towards me as an outsider - I think I get on very well with them both incidentally."

He then went on to describe how after he had watched the student teach a music lesson, made very difficult by a school situation outside her control, the teacher waited to support the student:

Tutor : "...he rushed across to me and before I could get a word in edgeways he started to explain all those things - like did I realise the lesson had been moved across - and she'd done wonderful well - and didn't I think it was wonderful that she had the guts to try and do it when she wasn't a musician and only had the basic rudiments. You couldn't have asked for a more supportive situation."

Stage 3

At this stage of the practice the teacher began to be involved in more of his responsibilities as deputy head. The joint planning continued as before but the student began to take nearly complete responsibility for the running of the class. The team teaching came to a stop. This, itself, created another extensive round of re-planning which put considerable pressure on the student. Again she had the full support of the teacher and the tutor and she was more than prepared to take on this responsibility herself. It is significant that, at this stage, when the student had to work more often in an autonomous way, that she began to express some diverging opinions about changes she would like to make in the classroom organisation.

It was possible at this stage to recognise the supervision strategy of the tutor first from his notes and then in discussion. The first section of a set of TP notes contained positive feedback (often glowing praise) on the performance of the student often referring to the responses of the children which he had observed.

Tutor: "I'm not sure whether I ever go in to see students with a view to actually taking on board what they are doing wrong....rather to actually see what they are doing right."

This was followed by, perhaps, one or two points for the student's consideration. The reports of T and S show that he also spent a lot of time in discussion more often with the student on her own and that these discussions were very wide ranging.

Tutor: "With someone like S its easier because the ongoing position is so strong that you actually in effect can use a shorthand approach to point out where things were going wrong... but its far easier with someone of S's standard to generalise. I don't find that we

discuss in such a specific classroom context."

This view was corroborated by the investigator who found herself involved in very sophisticated discussions about many aspects of teaching with the student.

The good relationship between tutor, student and teacher continued. At this stage the teacher said that he talked less to the tutor partly because there were no problems and, partly, because he trusted the tutor. He was satisfied that the tutor was making appropriate judgements of the student's teaching and he admired the tutor's strategy of praising the student and then spending time discussing general issues.

The tutor himself respected the teacher/student relationship and felt that his own role with the student was peripheral compared with that of the teacher.

Tutor: "I think that in terms of student/teacher or tutor relationships that there is only scope for one significant other in a student's practical placement."

He described his role as he saw it, i.e. presenting another point of view or opinion "which S definitely wanted because she was very aware of the close supportive relationship with T", (investigator's notes). From the accounts of the student it was clear that he had an important role in stimulating discussion of teaching issues and in smoothing over any difficulties in reconciling college and school requirements. For example, the college requirements for lesson planning were not really compatible within the continual flexibility in that classroom. The tutor knew this and negotiated a more acceptable file presentation).

Comment

Relationships

The very warm supportive relationships have been well documented above. The whole atmosphere was one of trust, mutual respect and liking. A very interesting feature was the way the tutor described the process of adapting his role to that of T and S in school, and his shrewd judgement of the influence he was likely to have.

There were in the final stages pointers which showed a more substantial disagreement with the teacher's ways of working than were apparent previously.

Student's strengths and weaknesses.

The reports of all the participants suggested that S was a particularly strong student. It is important to be aware of the demands being made of this student in terms of the continuous re-planning which was necessary with such a flexible approach. Because of the apparent ease with which S dealt with this it was easy to under-estimate the demands which were being made of her. It became clear from the data that her professional development went well beyond enabling her to function in that one classroom.

Help and support received by the student

Again the help and support which S received have been set

out above. Particularly important in this situation were the complementary roles of teacher and tutor. The teacher offered regular advice of a day to day practical nature and engaged in a collaborative planning and teaching environment. The tutor as well as offering very positive feedback also represented an alternative opinion and second judgement stimulating generalisation of specific teaching points. As well as this he eased potential difficulties between the competing requirements made of S by school and college.

Classification This was a very effective collaborator situation between two reflective people. The evidence at the end suggested potential for development towards a more characteristically protagonist relationship.

Case study 18 O/T/S/6

Tutor group: 4

Investigator: 3 visits

Tutor: summary sheets

Teacher: skill sheet

Teacher: discussion

Stage 1

The tutor reported a friendly reception in the school but a feeling of unease between teacher, tutor and student. The student was very nervous with little to say. The tutor felt that the teacher was very guarded and defensive, particularly he was reluctant to discuss the Maths scheme he used (the tutor was a Maths tutor). The teacher's comment was only that "everything is fine" and trio discussion was not fruitful. Eventually a common interest in computers stimulated some discussion between teacher and tutor. The tutor wanted to chat to the student on her own to check that all was well but was unable to do this. She also needed to comment on some quite serious deficiencies in the student's first teaching session but felt constrained by the presence of the teacher. The investigator experienced the same friendly but guarded action. However, fairly direct questioning by the investigator led to comments from the student to the teacher like "oh! I meant to ask you about that".

Stage 2

The accounts of all the participants suggested some improvement in the relationship. The timetable had been finalised and the student was now teaching for longer periods. The teacher kept strict control of the Maths scheme although the student sometimes administered it. The student, on the other hand, under covert teacher supervision concentrated on the topic and language work including some topic Maths. The teaching of the two tended to run in parallel, with the teacher always near the classroom and readily available, usually listening to "readers" or teaching a small group. Once again direct questioning by the investigator produced such responses from the student as "oh! we must talk about that". The tutor reported about S and T, "a good working relationship but rather shallow". She, herself, had her first useful discussion with the teacher during this stage at a time when the student had been taken home ill. He was much more relaxed with the tutor and moved away from his habitual comment that "everything is fine" to make some more analytical comments about the student's teaching. The tutor saw little of the student's teaching during this time because her choice of visiting time was not well co-ordinated with the student's teaching time. Some of the problem here was that the student did all her own planning at the last minute so that any pre-teaching discussion was impossible. Neither teacher nor tutor insisted on the planning being completed earlier.

Stage 3

During this stage there was a much more relaxed atmosphere.

The student chatted in some detail to the investigator about what she was doing. The tutor reported that "genuine enthusiasm now shows". The student was also more confident about aspects of teaching which had been problems initially (e.g. catering for a large class of children who were finishing at different times). There was some indication that S was becoming more willing to share her problems with the teacher. There was still no evidence of any shared planning only of a joint recognition of some of the problems. The two were working closely enough together for the student to accept the teacher's help in using the word processor (something which could not have happened in the early stages).

However there were unresolved difficulties as described by the tutor. All planning was still "at the last minute" and the student seemed to perform in a mediocre way:

Tutor: "I don't know whether you know what I mean but she lacks sparkle."

and: "I am looking for anything where there might be a spark that I can develop and work on... not anything specific just generally....and I think a lot of that has to do with the class she is in as well...and the teacher.... There isn't the enthusiasm to get from the teacher I think."

The teacher's comment to the investigator was that the student was tired and was working as hard as she could but the tutor was still disappointed with S's efforts and found her much too easily satisfied. She believed that the school were much too generous in their praise of S.

Comment

Relationships

The relationship between the three participants was slow to develop. The nervousness of the student and the guardedness of the teacher made communication within the trio difficult. There was some evidence that the direct action taken with the teacher and student together did stimulate some discussion. (It may be significant that the tutor preferred to speak to S and T separately). As the practice developed the situation relaxed and more professional discussion was possible. In the final teacher discussion T was very positive about his enjoyment of the practice but he referred also to the initial difficulties.

T: "They (i.e. students) need a chance to build up their confidence and I find that student's lack leadership quality that you develop as a teacher because you have to, and they are shy, a lot of themI mean I have only had young ladies and all the ladies I have had as students have been very shy and if you are with them you are intimidating but if you leave them you don't know what they are doing."

He tried to resolve this problem by keeping out of the classroom but leaving the partition door open.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

Teacher and tutor initially recognised certain weaknesses in the student but whereas the teacher was satisfied at the end of the practice the tutor was not. She found the student too complacent and easily satisfied once she had reached a fairly acceptable level. She found "no sparkle", little imagination and little motivation to become better or to explore.

Help and support received by the student

It is difficult to assess the help that the student needed and received. In the final discussion the reports of the teacher suggested that he was quite sensitive to her nervousness and what the tutor saw as lack of stimulation could have been defined as sensitive support by another observer. The tutor herself, although she visited each week did not always see the student teaching and the teacher was critical about this.

T: "My student finishes on Friday and she (tutor) has not seen her start a session yet. She comes in the middle of PE, at the end of something or when she is not teaching - and she's got a timetable....My student has had plenty of visits and encouragement but if she (tutor) had just come in in the first two weeks and seen the start then she'd have been able to talk competently about what she (student) had been doing and the way she teaches. As it is she has to ask me."

There was some indication from above that the teacher had a view of his own role and that of the tutor which was different from hers, i.e. that he did not expect to put in the input that she was hoping for.

The tutor was disappointed with the practice and questioned whether her own input came too late. She felt that in the early stages the student was heavily influenced by the teacher and she, the tutor wanted to get her (student) "on her own to talk to her".

Tutor: "...and then over the next couple of weeks she was taking note of things I said with regard to shouting, and she started to relax and enjoy herself. So up to half term in fact I was very pleased with her after being initially worried....but then she just sat back - she got so far and that's it!"

She also linked her own input with what the student was prepared to do, e.g.

Tutor: "I made a lot of suggestions and one day I had a car boot full of stuff for her display that I'd discussed with her the week before. When I got there, there was nothing there so the stuff stayed in my boot I'm afraid."

The tutor wondered whether she had "clamped down" too late and also saw the influence of the teacher as over-riding her influence.

Tutor: "I wasn't working closely with the teacher
....all he was doing was sitting there

saying everything was great, there's no problem....life was very pleasant (i.e. in the eyes of T) but it wasn't."

Classification A collaborator relationship, functioning at a superficial level, which tended to exclude the influence of the tutor.

Case study 19 P/T/S/10

Tutor group: 4

Tutor: summary sheets

Teacher: discussion

Student: discussion group

Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

The organisation of the timetable was very efficiently and systematically arranged in this school. This was partly influenced by the teacher's wish to make use of an extra person in the classroom in order for her to spend time in helping the slower children with their Maths work. The teacher took out all the slower children for all the Maths work, whereas S took out the slower children for S.R.A. language work.

During the initial stages of the teaching practice the student informed the teacher of her plans and the teacher contributed, very willingly, any necessary equipment. She also, occasionally, offered advice, (e.g. that the term "cold places" was too abstract to generate imaginative ideas in the minds of these children). There was very little talk about how a session had gone but there was some discussion of the needs of the slower children. Nearly all the discussion centred on the student's needs in terms of equipment. The student had watched the teacher teach and had picked up some of her mannerisms and phraseology.

The tutor recognised that the student had some initial organisational problems but was generally satisfied.

Tutor: "She does have problems with organising things but she is quite a strong personality. and the teacher stayed in as well (ie in that lesson which the tutor watched) and seemed willing to help out. She seemed very supportive actually....I have no basic worries about her at all. T and I had a chat and compared notes and generally agreed on what she had done."

The tutor saw the student as quite an independent person with the teacher ready and even trying to offer advice. He described them as "a teacher (i.e. T) with a reluctant pupil (i.e. S).

Stage 2

The interaction described above seemed to decrease during this stage. It seemed that the role of the teacher in providing equipment was no longer necessary. She still made a quick check that the student had everything, especially on those occasions when she was going to be committed elsewhere. In contrast to the situation in stage 1 the tutor was now concerned that the teacher was not offering feedback to the student.

Tutor: "S is unsure whether the teacher thinks she is doing well. I was asking her you know "what does T think about this?" and she said "I can't make it out". I put it in my way to have a chat with T and she's very shy - well very quiet and shy and I find it very difficult to relate to her, you know. She's not forthcoming with anything.

If you ask her a question she will answer it directly and monosyllabically."

In the meantime the student was very anxious indeed for this feedback and she also wanted to discuss the development of the topic and Science work. She had hoped to develop some limited team teaching with the teacher. During this stage the tutor's notes were quite short often offering positive feedback, e.g. "a quiet orderly start" and "a good end to the lesson with plenty of encouragement". He was a Science tutor and when the lesson was Science he joined in the teaching. Referring to the student's independent thinking he reported "Generally S is willing to take advice but needs to be convinced the advice is sound."

Stage 3

The parallel teaching of T and S described for the previous stages was maintained during this stage. The effect of this seemed to be that they never discussed their teaching with each other and because they were teaching at the same time T did not know what S was doing, e.g. S was very pleased to show the investigator the development of her work on time but at no stage had she shown it to the teacher. There had been no teacher/student discussion of S's work with the slow learning language group despite the fact that they were team teaching in that session. In fact, the teacher usually took her group out of the room. There was no animosity and the student described the school staff as extremely friendly.

At this stage it became possible to ask the teacher for her account of the situation (she had not been available during the second visit). She described the student as "very self assured" and "not wanting interference", also that S did not inform her of what she was going to do although she would have liked to know. She was rather unhappy about two actions of S and the tutor. First, S had asked for her help in team teaching and the teacher was willing to comply. However, she felt that this was an "unreal" situation for the student (since a teacher could not necessarily expect that sort of help under "normal" classroom conditions). In the light of this anxiety she felt she needed more guidelines from college about what her role should be. Secondly, the tutor, in an attempt to let the student feel free to experiment had told her that she was in no danger of failing. He had not discussed his reasons with the teacher and she felt that he should not have given S this information at this stage of the practice.

At this stage the tutor did renew his efforts to generate discussion with the teacher, i.e. about possible new directions for the Science work. One factor which made his interaction with T temporarily more fruitful was when he was able to discuss possible points for the TP report with her. As he put it this gave him "something tangible to talk about" and so "gave a sense of purpose" to their discussion.

Comment

Relationships

Referring to the atmosphere in the school the student was not so much impressed by their helpfulness as by their extreme friendliness.

S "I don't know that the staff in my school were particularly helpful really - well if they had got things in their classroom and I needed them they would let me have them - but the nicest thing about the staff in my school was that - I don't know other schools I have found it in so much - they were so friendly and put you at your ease to start with, so I didn't feel like an intruder."

However, her relationship with T seemed to be characterised not by ill-feeling but just by a parsity of communication. S badly wanted feedback from T but T, despite wanting information from the student and confidences felt that S did not want her interference. This led to a situation where they taught in a parallel way.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

Both T and the tutor were satisfied that S had reached a fair standard of teaching competence. It is typical of this trio that once an acceptable standard was achieved further discussion became unnecessary.

Help and support received by the student

The situation described under "relationships" influenced the amount of help which S received. The tutor visited regularly, sometimes helped in the classroom and always commented on a small range of teaching behaviours without going into detail about any of them. However, he found time for some discussion with S which she felt was very important because she needed the view of "an outsider" to make her think in a different way. According to S, even discussion with the investigator had this effect. It is not possible to judge the extent to which the teacher could have contributed to this role because it was not a role which she saw for herself. It became clear from the teacher discussion that the whole Teaching Practice had raised issues in her mind which she had never considered before. She had been surprised to be asked to team teach and to offer advice and felt that the requirements being made of her should be set out in a formal way.

T: "Do you think guidelines from college might be useful all round, especially about the question of staying in the classroom?"

Her original view of TP was that the student was "on her own" and the teacher's role was to give support by the provision of the necessary materials, information and equipment.

This attitude along with the shyness of T and the air of self assurance of S contributed to the rather limited communication of the pair. The tutor was liked and respected by both but never really became part of a close professional team.

Classification An initial teacher/pupil relationship not really welcomed by the student. When this became unnecessary the relationship showed very little professional co-operation. However, there was potential for such a development, probably towards a protagonist relationship.

Case study 20 Q/T1/S1/11

Tutor: notes

Investigator: 3 visits

Tutor group: 5

Tutor: summary sheets

Teacher: diary

Teacher: skill sheet

Teacher: discussion

Stage 1

During the first two weeks the teacher played a very important instructional role. Despite S's reservations T insisted on staying in the class with her, explaining that she needed to see what was going on in order to help the student. See investigator's notes.

"Teacher produced a detailed diary of what she had talked about with S - very full. She has observed a lot and picked things up in a sympathetic way, e.g. the work sheet was very good but it would be better if she had two. She was very anxious to show me everything and discuss it. Together they have altered the student's lesson plan presentation to make it more detailed and developmental. S did express some concern about the teacher's presence in the classroom to T and to the tutor. She refers to the usefulness of the help but had some initial anxieties about establishing her own ground rules with the class."

The teacher's instructions were quite precise, e.g.: don't talk over the children's voices;; insist on quiet before giving instructions; don't rush instructions etc., and she gave help at the planning stage. The teacher was also quick to praise aspects of S's teaching and made sure other people noticed them. The teacher sometimes anticipated problems for S without trying to put any pressure on her. An example from the investigator's notes showed this:

"...she asked if there was enough Maths work (anticipating that there wouldn't be), the student thought yes. The teacher then suggested that if any children finished early, causing difficulties for the student, they should be sent to her. In fact S did send some children."

The tutor referred to S's apprehensions and slight resentment, (i.e. at the teacher's early presence in the classroom), but also to the sensitive attitude of the teacher.

Tutor: "I think it was just a lot of apprehension on S's part - I think T is a very nice person I enjoyed talking to her."

At this stage the tutor also found quite a number of aspects of the student's teaching which needed attention but he was only to pick on a few at any one time, e.g.

Tutor: "There were a lot of things which had it been week 3 I would have picked up on but as it was week 1 I just stressed the positive stuff."

Stage 2

The investigator's notes read:

"Once again T has kept lengthy notes but is, clearly, moving out of the classroom, e.g. helped S plan a poetry

lesson and then left her to get on with it."

This was quite typical of the interaction at this stage, the teacher still making some contribution to planning but generally giving the student more independence. It was also apparent at this stage that the student was beginning to use her own initiative, which pleased the teacher very much. The teacher took her role very seriously and made special arrangements, despite a teaching commitment, to see the investigator and discuss progress. She also welcomed the fact that she had been able to make an input because she felt that she was "losing her class less". It took away her anxieties about whether the children were making progress.

At this stage the tutor referred to the more relaxed working relationship. He anticipated that with the increasing competence of the student the teacher would withdraw more and more rather than the two working collaboratively as colleagues.

Tutor: "I'm sure it would never move into the collaborator idiom as you understand it. S has won T's respect because S's own self confidence has grown enormously and she is actually doing some damn good work and some marvellous display - which has moved her up after a fairly tentative start, to the level in that school of being a relatively high achiever. In terms of what S and T can contribute to each other now I tend to think its minimal because in their own ways they are two extremely strong minded women and will not take on board anything from anybody, including myself, that they don't particularly want to take on board."

His own contribution at this stage was analytical and notable for the way he built up an argument for the comments he wanted to make, e.g. in discussing a Maths lesson he praised various aspects of explanation and presentation and then went on to describe the behaviour of some children, (i.e. that they were confused and raced through the work), before he suggested the possibility of grouping the children - which from his later account was the point he wanted to raise. In response to this S and T prepared a lesson implementing group work for the tutor to watch, but it never became a regular feature of S's teaching (T did not practice group work either).

The tutor maintained a good working relationship, separately with T and S, especially the latter. He was a person who tended to make good social relationships in schools and this enhanced his supervisory role. He felt that the nature of this research made that difficult for him in this situation, i.e. that his conversation with this teacher was strictly related to what he might want her to look for in the student's teaching. As well as this, this teacher appeared to see the investigator as the point of contact who would give her feedback on "the success of her strategies."

Stage 3

During this stage there was a general satisfaction that the student was performing very competently, see investigator's notes:

"The teacher is well satisfied with the practice and her contribution to it. S still sometimes asks for advice and T glances through her plans each day to see that nothing will go drastically wrong. Not much input re:content. They don't talk about specific children just the class as a whole i.e. what "the class" can and cannot do. She recognises a difference in style between herself and S."

In the opinion of the tutor, the teacher had made her input in terms of helping S to develop certain skills but that any discussion beyond that was unlikely.

Tutor: "T has the view that a lot of teaching is commonsense - if you are tuned into the same same wave-length it doesn't need to be made very explicit."

His argument was that, in the mind of the teacher, this had, successfully, taken place.

The tutor's notes were full of warm praise and a fairly close analysis of the teaching sessions he observed. His satisfaction with the results achieved were related to what he believed COULD take place in "this school" and with "this student". He believed these were important factors in judging his own expectations and input.

During a tutor discussion group he described a teaching session which, in his opinion, required the children to be grouped.

Tutor: "...which worked quite well (i.e. the session under discussion) but didn't she think it would have been of benefit to group the children and she said that T had told her specifically not to group the children - it should be done as a whole class lesson. So really in terms of a closer analysis if you like of grouping and how children learn, its always going to be very limited in that context, by the ethos of the school."

He saw the student's own beliefs and values as a further impediment to any worthwhile discussion of different teaching styles.

Tutor: "What I'm really saying is that I think in the case of S if I leaned ,and I would have to do it subtly,there might be something in the group practice but basically S is not a student who is inclined to believe in the value of groups and I can't honestly see S if she was given a free hand by a headteacher two years from nowno! that she would only toe the line if she works with a headteacher who says THIS is the way we operate."

The student herself suggested to the investigator that she would have liked to experiment with group language activities, but the tutor was sceptical of this. Again his argument was that you can influence immediate classroom skills but not beliefs.

Comment

Relationships

A very strong professional, instructional relationship was evident between teacher and student. This appeared to be highly successful in the early stages but did not develop into a collaborative relationship as between two colleagues. The tutor maintained a friendly relationship with the school and his expressed opinion was respected but he felt that the social relationship which would have led to a more relaxed atmosphere was adversely affected by the nature of this research.

The student's strengths and weaknesses

This student had had an indifferent first teaching practice and began very anxiously and defensively. Her skill and confidence increased enormously. She came to show considerable independence of thought and she had some very imaginative ideas. The range within her teaching style was rather restricted. It was suggested by the tutor that she was quite sophisticated socially and knew how to "please" the teacher and the tutor - with the former by asking advice even when she had reached a stage of not needing it and with the latter putting as paramount the requirements of the school in order to deflect without offence his requirements.

The tutor felt that her restricted teaching style was a weakness but after the practice the student in discussion with the investigator picked up group work as one aspect of her teaching which she felt she had not had opportunities to practice.

Help and support received by the student

The help which S received from the teacher has been described and illustrated above. There was also a considerable input by the tutor in terms of very positive feedback and a detailed and helpful analysis of teaching sessions. It was clear that he could influence the thinking of S and T (e.g. joint planning of group work lesson in Maths), but he felt that this influence was limited and he should not take too much advantage of it. Disappointingly, the instructional relationship between teacher and student did not develop into a more discursive relationship which might have encouraged the student to develop and practice a greater range of teaching behaviour and a more critical approach to her teaching. In the light of the student's comments about group work it is interesting to speculate about the potential of the tutor to initiate in this area.

Classification An effective teacher/pupil relationship which did not develop any further. There was evidence of the potential for such a development with a collaborator relationship being the most likely.

Case study 21 Q/T2/S2/11

Tutor: notes
Tutor group: 5
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: skill sheet
Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

From the early stages of the practice it seemed that S worked in an independent way. The investigator's notes read:

"S likes to make her own plans and then ask for comment, not to be helped with planning."

The tutor commented:

"S seems to be very confident, she certainly seems to be negotiating the class on her own terms."

The teacher referred to S's initiative and willingness to leave plans aside and follow her own interests and those of the children.

However, there was also an input from the teacher. She asked with interest about what S was going to do and commented and advised if requested to (e.g. when asked to comment on S's plan for the Art lesson she suggested not to let the children have a free choice or "there would be chaos"). She contributed materials and, perhaps most importantly for S, she commented with praise on the work the children produced for S.

The tutor's notes for S were very positive, commenting on his judgement of the children's ability but also explaining in some detail what he was praising in the student's teaching behaviour. He introduced the notion that the set class work might not be appropriate for all the children.

Both S and T, while not at all hostile, were quite reserved towards the investigator.

Stage 2

At this stage the teacher described a change in her relationship with S, see investigator's notes:

"Pattern has changed in that T feels she has less of an eye on what S is doing. S provides an outline at the beginning of the week but T finds out much more now by spontaneous conversation - she EMPHASISES this."

T's input was now coming as a result of spontaneous conversation, (e.g. when S expressed anxiety about the quality of her display T helped; in a discussion about the theme of "caring" T made a suggestion for drama work, which was her specialism). The teaching commitments of T and S were still quite compartmentalised and this produced some problems in dovetailing their teaching, with each finding it necessary to ask the other for time to finish things off. There was a move to relieve this by team teaching for some of the Maths work. During this stage the teacher sometimes asked to come into the classroom to watch a lesson because she "was interested in the lesson". The student reported this with warmth and pleasure.

The tutor's notes at this stage were still full of praise but with comments on the amount of "transmission" teaching. When he brought this up with the class teacher she said that the student did sometimes use a more exploratory type of group work and, in fact, used it more than the class teacher herself. The tutor expressed his unease more forcibly in the discussion group.

Tutor: "Sometimes I watch things going on where the class teacher is clearly very satisfied and its working with the kids and the student is using the class teacher as a model. How do we start to shape things beyond that? I think that obviously the student's success in school in a specific situation has to be a priority but on the other hand its our job as educators to give them a sparkling."

Stage 3

At this stage the amount of spontaneous discussion had either increased again or the participants had relaxed enough with the investigator to discuss their working relationship. The atmosphere made it possible to introduce the skills list which generated some interesting information from the teacher about the quality of S's teaching. T was very impressed with this and referred to initiatives which S had introduced into the classroom, one of these was group work. For her part, S described herself as "quietly confident" and spent time pointing out the quite significant input of the teacher, particularly in the areas of drama and display.

The tutor was still full of praise particularly for the discussion work that was going on in the classroom. His notes no longer referred to alternative styles of teaching although he still believed that the student was using, basically, a transmission mode. He justified his action on the grounds that it was not easy to work against the ethos of a school (see below and case study 20).

Comment

Relationships

Social relationships were important for both teacher and student and it took a little time for these to develop.

S: "You've got to know the teacher and tutor are there to help you - if you feel they are there just solely to test you, see how you are doing then you won't have a good relationship. I had a really good relationship with both T and tutor. I felt it was partly because I knew I could go to them if I had any problems - they were giving me all the help and support that I needed. If you haven't got that I don't think you are on a very good footing."

Quite noticeable in this case study was the need of the student to feel independent and self sufficient, e.g.

S: "I think it helped me when I went in on the first or second visit when my teacher said "when you come in, this class is your class and you must do what you want"....I mean that could be taken that she's saying that but didn't mean it but I could see in the first week that she did actually mean it."

This was an important theme for the student particularly in the early stages.

The teacher also gave great importance to comfortable sensitive relationships. She made comparatively little contribution in the teacher discussion group but ALL her contributions were about sensitive behaviour to the student and good social relationships with the tutor, e.g.

T: "I don't think you can really work well until you have established a relationship early on with the tutor."

and: "...it just broke the ice so when he came in I felt you could relate to somebody."

and: "Its very hard to make that individual contact (i.e. with the children) when somebody is there (i.e. in the classroom in the early stages of the practice).

It is perhaps typical of this teacher that while offering the student complete autonomy with the class she admitted privately that she missed her relationship with them.

The student's strengths and weaknesses

The evidence from the teacher, the tutor and the student herself suggest that S performed very competently in the classroom. The teacher described her as "an extremely good teacher" and elaborated on aspects of her work particularly when it was different from her own, i.e. the teacher's, style of teaching. The tutor praised, very regularly, aspects of the student's teaching e.g. "the level of response from the children was outstanding" is only one example of many.

It has been pointed out that the student was independent in her thinking and according to the tutor pre-disposed to class and transmission teaching. On the other hand the teacher offered a view of a student teacher using more group and practical work than she did.

During the third stage of the practice the student was more confident with the investigator and also more self critical about her work in general.

Help and support received by the student

The great sensitivity with which the teacher made an input into this teaching practice has been described. In a very quiet and unobtrusive way she supported the student with advice and help (especially about display and drama) but also by the interest she showed in the work the children were producing for the student.

The support which S received from the tutor has also been described. In the final discussion he expressed his unease about this student in more detail. He described her very good performance in a number of aspects of her teaching

(planning, content, class discussion, children's involvement in class activities) and his disappointment with others (imaginative group work, self initiated learning on the part of the children). In the final stage of the practice he had decided that his influence had gone as far as it could so that he only referred to her strengths without making attempts to encourage a more child centred practical approach, see investigator's report of his conversation:

"He believed that S was held by the limits of the school. If she had been at (another named school with a different ethos) and had had tutor 11 as tutor, she would have functioned at a quite different level, i.e. the school would have made heavy demands on S but tutor 11 would have been able to give the right sort of advice."

The tutor was not convinced that S even recognised the limits that the school placed upon her or that she would have understood him if he had tried to explain it. The tutor was confident in his judgement and in what he saw as the limits of the influence he could have. He believed that he had judged his input correctly. This may seem to be contradicted by the reports of teacher and student about the increase in group work and the high regard which they clearly had for him. Certainly it produced serious difficulties for him in writing his report since he wanted to refer to weaknesses which he had not pressed the student to rectify.

Classification An effective protagonist relationship which benefited from tutor input but might have benefited even more.

Case study 22

Tutor: notes
Tutor group: 6
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: discussion

Student: discussion group
Investigator visits: 3

Stage 1

The reports from the teacher suggested some early difficulties. The teacher's organisation was quite rigid and complicated, giving the children considerable choice of activity during the day but under tight control. The student in attempting to adopt this system had real problems e.g. books were not marked and checked, progress not monitored, children were wasting time or doing inappropriate things. The teacher had taken the initiative and decided that S should adopt a different and less complex system. She was well aware of her own forthright and charismatic approach to her teaching and the marked contrast this made with the quiet, precise, serious teaching of the student. In certain of the student's teaching sessions she had felt it necessary to interrupt and in order not to do this she began to spend less time in the classroom. The student felt that the teacher's interruptions were justified (e.g. "because I had never taught phonics in that way before").

The tutor met the teacher during the first week and found her "very helpful". However the contact was minimal after that and the tutor did not learn about the initial difficulties which the student had had. She recognised the support which the efficient school organisation would give to this student (as well as to S2 in the same school).

Tutor: "...an extremely well organised school
and in many ways if these students go
wrong it is their own fault."

She also recognised the student as having a quiet and serious nature.

Tutor: "...the second student is more of a viable
character, more gentle, less inventive,
less strong personality."

and the teacher by contrast "a strong personality".

Tutor: "I feel that the teacher there is a very
strong personality and when she is there
S sort of steps back but because of this
situation where the teacher wasn't there
at all she was much more forthcoming.

The tutor believed that S's commitments as a deputy headteacher kept her away from the classroom.

Stage 2

T and S reported that during this stage the organisation planned in stage 1 was successfully implemented and the student now moved towards an integrated day - a simplified form of what the teacher normally operated. As suggested above, the teacher rarely went into the classroom except for a specific purpose, (e.g. teaching the class while S took out a group for baking). Instead she monitored the student's activity from the outside, (i.e. from the

student's accounts of what was going on), giving organisational hints and detailed accounts of her own way of working. The teacher was very impressed by the student's application to her work and by the way she listened to the teacher and made notes on all that was said to her. There was one brief trio meeting during this stage when the different styles of teaching of S and T were mentioned and T also suggested that perhaps the able children needed more attention and more challenge. No strategies were discussed. With the student, the tutor raised the question of group work (in her written notes to the student) but again there was no discussion of this or of strategies for its implementation. The tutor made a contribution to the student's topic work by suggesting an interest table and by bringing in books. She found the student unresponsive to this idea and generally unimaginative.

Tutor: "S is a bit too maternal with the children
- a bit too set in her ways - she needs a bit of
buzz, fizz, that's what's lacking."

Stage 3

By this time T saw it as no longer necessary to monitor S's teaching. "I trust her". There was still discussion when S asked for advice or an opinion and it was clear that S saw T as her "relevant partner" rather than the tutor. For the first time S referred to the fact that the teacher's style of teaching could be a problem for her as a student teacher because she, the student, was "not like that". The lack of communication between teacher/student and tutor became apparent at this stage e.g.

(i) In discussion and written notes the tutor referred to a "poor phonics lesson" which S had taught "because the teacher said she had to". This was the reason the student gave to the tutor but, in fact, she did not agree with the opinion of the tutor and neither did the teacher.

(ii) The written reference made by the tutor to group work was criticised by teacher and student because it showed ignorance of how the class was organised and illustrated well that the tutor was seeing only a very limited range of S's teaching.

It was clear at this stage that both T and S discounted the comments of the tutor without discussing them. The fact that the tutor came in the same day every week, attempted to fit in her visits to the two students (in that school) in that block of time, and had little time to talk to teachers or students were presented as anxieties to the investigator.

The tutor's comments at this stage reverted back to simple management problems and the fact that "the student is making mistakes which she shouldn't be doing towards the end of year 3 teaching practice", that she was "nagging the children" and that she was "content to mark time".

Comment

Relationships

The differences in personality between S and T have been

noted. S summarised this during the student discussion.

S: "Things that make it difficult? Well, if you've got a clash of personalities between the teacher and the student because as you know my teacher had a totally different personality to me, but we got on very well and she let me do things my way, some teachers might not have done that - they might have thought well I don't want anybody coming in and doing things differently. I want it kept how I do it."

All the participants recognised the personality difference. Teacher and student, despite this, maintained good social and professional relationships. The trio relationship was less satisfactory from the point of view of the teacher and the student although the tutor did not report any unease. Satisfactory surface relationships were maintained with an underlying lack of communication.

S: "As I said to you, with your teacher you've got them there all the time. If you are going to do something the next day and you are not quite sure how you are going to approach it you always say to your teacher "Oh I thought of doing this would you do it this way?" If she thinks of a better way of doing it she might say "have you thought of this way of doing it?"

This is typical of the relationship which this student had with the teacher and yet the tutor described her as someone who "does not ask questions or raise issues."

The teacher and the student were dissatisfied with the amount of time the tutor spent in school and gradually came to give little attention to her comments or opinion. However, this created a problem for the teacher of where her responsibility lay and where was that of the tutor.

T: "Sometimes its difficult to know what they have been taught in college. We don't really know. You are very much in the dark as to whether you are in charge or the tutor.... We've discussed this (i.e. with other T in the school)....well my girl certainly hasn't seen much of her tutor."

Strengths and weaknesses

S was not described by teacher or tutor as a strong student, but whereas T was pleased with her systematic, hard working approach and her progress the tutor was critical of her lack of progress. There is no doubt that she learnt to run the complex classroom organisation in a way that satisfied the class teacher who had already made it clear that she had high expectations of student teachers. The tutor referred only to specific sessions (e.g. work on phonics) and appeared dissatisfied with some aspects of management (e.g. what she considered to be an absence of group work which wasn't actually the case according to the accounts of the teacher and student). Particularly the tutor talked about a lack of sparkle. The teacher had some concerns about the student, e.g. "she

doesn't do what I would call real teaching in a face to face manner". She did not discuss with tutor or student.

Help and support received by the student

In the early stages of the practice the student received a great deal of help from the teacher who simplified the classroom organisation and gave a lot of advice about how to run it. The student was very willing to ask for advice and equipment. Later, the teacher only monitored the student's teaching but S still felt able to ask for advice if the teacher was available. The teacher was sensitive about not staying in the classroom because of the disruptive influence this sometimes had on the student's authority over the children.

However when the student had reached a certain level of competence the teacher spent much less time with her and gave more attention to her role of deputy head. The student could ask for specific help in advance but had no opportunity to discuss any issues which were not directly related to her day to day teaching. Interestingly, the tutor described this as one of her own functions, i.e. that the class teacher could help with the day to day running of the class but the tutor could raise wider issues and a different point of view. For some reason she did not do it in this classroom.

In the eyes of the teacher and the student she was not successful because (i) they had little confidence in her opinion (ii) she did not understand the organisation of that classroom so her remarks were inappropriate and could not be applied (iii) she spent very little time in discussion with the student and even less with the teacher. She reported that the teacher was never available for discussion but the reports from the teacher and the student suggest that she could easily have made herself available if requested.

Classification An effective teacher/pupil relationship in the early stages. There was potential for a subsequent protagonist relationship which did not develop.

Case study 23 R/T2/S2/12

Tutor: notes
Tutor group: 6
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: discussion group

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

The general satisfaction of the student was noticeable from the very beginning. The investigator's notes read:

"Student COMPLETELY happy with everything - appears extremely settled and confident - no problems with schemes or organisation."

She had taken over the same organisation of the teacher and nothing was problematic. The teacher was equally satisfied with their relationship. They were able to find plenty of time for discussion when they talked about planning, retrospective comments, resources, ability levels of the children, the work the children were producing - all this in detail. It was a large classroom and the teacher worked with a tiny group in the classroom but hidden from the rest of the room. Her knowledge of what had gone on made their discussion easy and natural. The student found the teacher's presence in no way threatening. The teacher referred positively to the open extrovert manner of the student especially by comparison with the other student in the school (see case study 22). The tutor also expressed her satisfaction.

Tutor: "...an extremely well organised school and in many ways if students go wrong it is their own fault."

and: "S is quite a strong minded student - very well prepared and the teacher is operating in the classroom with a tiny group. I think she is giving them some help or something and so she has still got her eye on the situation - but she is very tactful about withdrawing to a corner and I felt right from the start that here is a student who is most anxious to develop into a young professional and is getting on with the job."

Two further points are relevant at this stage. First, the teacher was not altogether satisfied with her relationship with the tutor. She was unhappy that the tutor visited school on the same day and at the same time each week, and as she put it:

T: "Its much better if you know the tutor because I haven't really made much headway with this one."

The teacher was helpful in fitting in with the tutor's requirements but it did not lead to any trio discussion.

Tutor: "...she (student) wasn't a bit put off by my being there and the teacher and then they went back to the classroom (i.e. the class after Music and Movement) and the teacher took over and S and I went back to the staffroom."

Secondly, both T and S saw a reflective, discursive

discussion of teaching as rather unnecessary. S found it difficult to explain and justify her classroom organisation because her decisions each day depended on what was happening at any one moment and it all seemed to her to be common sense. Similarly, the teacher did not feel it necessary to discuss matters "which are not a problem". See the investigator's notes:

"Both were non-plussed by my introduction of the skills sheet and the suggestion that they might discuss different aspects of their teaching. They assured me of their regular discussion and especially that there were no problems."

Stage 2

The very close co-operation was maintained and increased during this stage. The list of their discussion points was very long, e.g. what are you going to do to-morrow? how has it gone? suggestions, discussion of individual children, sharing of resources, the best way to use certain materials. The interaction was very balanced e.g. the teacher might suggest that some work should be done in Maths but the student might suggest an alternative way of using the teacher's workcards. The teacher was full of praise for the student and very anxious to show the investigator all the work the student had done in the classroom. Again, the student did not find it necessary to explain any of her procedures in detail although the teacher referred to innovations within the classroom. It was noticeable again that, although S and T were always interviewed separately, their accounts were nearly identical.

The separation between the tutor and the teacher/student pair became increasingly apparent during this stage. The tutor described S as "very positive", "inventive", and Tutor: "...all the time she is looking for new ideas so there is a spark there."

The tutor at this stage was confident about the student and was "looking for things which the student misses". Her notes referred to children's presentation of work, letter formation, correcting children's work and evaluating story telling. The student and the teacher saw these as rather peripheral "criticisms" of the way things were done in that classroom. The tutor also asked them to use the skill sheet as a basis for discussion about teaching. They found this superfluous and irrelevant to their work. The discussion of the interest table (which the tutor suggested should be set up in the classroom) was quite prominent in the tutor's notes and in her discussion in the tutor group.

Stage 3

Both T and S expressed with complete confidence their satisfaction with the teaching practice. S believed she had had the opportunity to try out everything she wanted to. She was very pleased with the group activity which she had initiated and with the problem solving in the topic work. T and S felt that their discussion "goes on all the time" and that between them they were ensuring that the children covered everything they should, making satisfactory

progress. S still reported making decisions daily on the spot, about what it was appropriate to do. She also expressed some resentment towards the tutor particularly about her attitude towards the teaching of phonics and her questioning of the ability of these young children to make decisions in their group work. See investigator's notes:

"S quite resents the tutor who "nit-picks" (e.g. phonics, groupwork). T is definitely the "relevant other" and the tutor the "outsider". Her opinion is not altogether taken seriously. This is also the opinion of T since she knows the children and the class and must know how to give advice. Both T and S see their teaching styles as similar to each other."

The tutor referred again to the interest table suggesting that it should be extended. In her notes she questioned its educational value. S felt that this was an unreasonable question since the tutor had suggested its use in the first place.

Comment

Relationships

The relationship between the teacher and the student was very friendly, supportive and co-operative. It was clear that there was endless conversation about the children and the teaching. They both perceived their teaching styles to be very similar and each recognised the others strengths and weaknesses. Many joint decisions were made.

However, the relationship between the tutor and the teacher/student pair exhibited less understanding. First both T and S were dissatisfied with the length of the tutor visits and the fact that they were always on the same day of the week. Their expressed concern was not really the lack of help for the student (since they did not believe that the student needed any help which the tutor could give over and above what the class teacher was already giving) but that the tutor was not getting a true picture of how the classroom was run and what S was doing with the children.

S: "She came in every Wednesday morning. Now to me that is no use whatsoever. All she saw was a discussion - that's all she saw for the last seven weeks. Now I would have thought it would have been better if she came in and saw different lessons."

T and S had little respect for the tutor's opinion and when she questioned teaching behaviour, raised issues or made suggestions they saw this as trying to exercise undue influence.

S: "I think its because.....don't you feel when your tutor comes in and she says "well, couldn't you have done it this way, or no, maybe that would have been better".....don't you think she's putting her ideas. She's trying not exactly to make you what she sees as a perfect teacher but she's trying to put her ideas across - she doesn't like your ideas -

now I think that's wrong."
and: "(tutor) came in and she said "I don't think that it'll work. I don't think the children have the confidence or the ability". Now if she had been in the school she would have known those children do have the confidence."
The extent of the misunderstanding seemed rather sad since the tutor's professed aim was certainly NOT to try and advocate a particular approach.

Tutor: "Yes its one of the themes I would like to see. I certainly don't want to see students doing what I want them to do. I want to see them having sufficient initiative and professional "nouse" to make their own decisions."

The lack of discussion between tutor and teacher/student pair appeared not to be caused by lack of opportunity, since the tutor described the teacher as being available and arrangements were made in school for the tutor to talk to the student if she wanted to. Rather, there appeared to be a lack of time and trust. T and S saw her only as having an evaluation function not as having a relevant opinion of the teaching going on in that classroom.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

S was described by T and tutor as confident, imaginative and innovative. She was also forthright in offering opinions. Her teaching practice was warmly praised by the teacher and the tutor. The tutor described her as always looking for ways to improve herself but there was some evidence to suggest that while she was self-critical in the sense that she always asked if she was "going wrong" in any way she was not particularly reflective. She expressed herself as completely satisfied with the teaching practice and saw no areas for improvement or where she had not had opportunities experiment. She found it very difficult to discuss her teaching behaviour, seeming to function at an effective but intuitive level. She rejected any opportunities to talk in general terms about teaching.

Help and support received by the student

The collaborative relationship between teacher and student gave extensive opportunities for the teacher to offer help. The student received advice, support, help, positive feedback, resources particularly in the early stages and in areas of weakness (e.g. Music). However, even more than that the discussion encouraged the generation of ideas and both T and S reported very positively on this, i.e. that both had learned a great deal from the collaboration. The tutor recognised in a general way the role of the class teacher but felt that there was also a role for the tutor.

Tutor: "I think...the students do relate...most students not all...most students do relate at these two levels as I was trying to hint at earlier. On the practical level in the classroom they run to the teacher because she does know - she knows the individual children in a way that the tutor just cannot hope to

know...for some of the introduction of the ideas...again,.its not all the ideas that come from the tutor, they often come from the teacher. ...but the tutor...they do turn to some tutors. At least I do feel that my students at any rate on occasion say "Well I'd like to do this, how do I set about it?" or I say to the student "Would you like to try this?" and they'll genuinely go ahead and try it out."

She also distinguished between students:

Tutor: "...because in making my frame of reference I attempt to..ur..assess the student..personality capabilities and all the things I might have picked up....So with each student I attempt as it were to set a norm that it relates not only to what I expect of the profession in general but I attempt to see it in terms of that individual student...and in fact the good student I'll go in and make demands of that that student."

In the good students she was looking for "initiative and excitement" not "survival techniques" and also the possibility of "applying theory". At the same time she expected students and teachers to be able to:

Tutor: "distinguish between professional analysis and comments about them personally."

In this practice the professional analysis which she said she hoped to achieve was not approached. There were a number of possible explanations. First, T and S did not value her opinion. Secondly, they took her comments as unjustified criticism not professional analysis. Thirdly, she never actually entered into extended discussion with T and S. The evidence suggests that the analysis she wished for may have been part of the teacher/student discussion of everyday classroom events but she was never part of those discussions so she was not able to offer her professional input to enhance the analysis. The move from specific to general appeared not to take place.

Classification A close and effective collaborator relationship which tended to exclude tutor input and the possibility of discussion of any wider educational issues.

Case study 24 U/T1/S1/13

Tutor: notes

Student: discussion group

Tutor group: 5

Investigator: 3 visits

Tutor: summary sheets

Teacher: diary

Teacher: skill sheet

Teacher: discussion

Stage 1

Most of the information about this stage came from tutor, student and the teacher's diary. See investigator's notes:

"Very little discussion with T at this first meeting - in fact, I was intimidated. Only later did the teacher give me the diary."

The diary supported by the reports of S showed the very extensive discussion which went on, e.g. standards of marking in Maths, student's self criticism, recognising how long it takes to copy something out, "don't cramp slow learners with too much correction", "recognise D.T.'s creative skill and use it as a resource", voice too sharp, children's need for props for mental calculation, student's excellent practice, what sort of sanctions to use with the children. This is only a set of examples to show the range of discussion. There was praise from the teacher, tips, but even more importantly, discussion points about which each, (i.e. teacher and student) had an opinion and often a different one, (e.g. the extent to which speech marks might stifle creativity). The student was full of praise for the teacher's supportiveness and for the extent of the discussion.

The tutor, at this stage, reported that he was looking for the establishment of good relationships between teacher, student and tutor and within the classroom.

Tutor: "I think that the students have this, as I did when I was a student. There is a tutor there who has seen a lesson plan and you think "I have got to get through this", and what I try to get over to them is that I don't mind if they don't complete it certainly in the first week/ten days so long as they set the ground rules then they can blossom."

and "...first of all I am looking as I have said for setting the ground and that is how I would assess the material they provide."

and " ...and really I am looking, is there a nice relationship between them and the teacher and if there is not what can I do about it."

This was reflected in the fairly brief notes which refer to "good opening" and then such things as use of eye contact and control techniques. There was also evidence of his response to information in the file, e.g. in response to a comment about a particular child who was having difficulties the tutor suggested that S should discuss it with the teacher.

Stage 2

The accounts of T and S described the same detailed and reflective discussion as described above. The diary indicated warm praise for the student's excellent performance, and at the same time a prolonged battle over the best way to mark punctuation! The student reported the high standards which the teacher expected of such things as display. However, despite the fact that T made many different suggestions to the student, S felt under no pressure to follow these if she felt that the action was inappropriate. She assured the investigator that she made her own decisions. The two had had extensive discussion about the next stage of the topic work, with T making a significant input in terms of ideas, resources and general interest as well as her knowledge of the children. Typical of this relationship were what can best be described as the friendly, reflective, argumentative discussions which took place. There were differences of opinion between the two which had to be dealt with sensitively, (e.g. S explained to the investigator how she had, initially, had to work hard to get the class to be what she would describe as quiet and manageable. The teacher's diary suggested that their views of what was manageable were different. However, they were resolved in a way which caused no damage to the warm and friendly relationship.)

During this stage the tutor was also beginning to establish a good relationship with the school and with the teacher. Initially, like the investigator he had found T quite intimidating.

Tutor: "Well I think the two I have got, (i.e. the two teachers) are both a bit mother-hennish in some respects but in different ways. The teacher that S has got when I first saw her I thought "Crumbs" very, very strict - very, very stern but her bark is a lot worse than her bite and she is a very nice lady, a very dear lady....It was quite funny the other week when I went in - we were chatting away there and I said "how are you getting on with S?" and she talked and then said "she even bared her body to me", I thought "Crumbs". Apparently S had had this rash and she (T) took her off down to the Health Centre and then she tried to get her in to see 3 doctors. You know she is really like a mother to her."

However, the tutor also recognised S's independent decision making.

Tutor: "S will listen to the teacher ,she will listen to me and then she will go her own way. The teacher feeds in ideas and equipment - from that point of view anything that S wants the teacher is ready and waiting."

The tutor was very satisfied with the progress of this student and the help that she was already receiving so that he spent less time with her than with the other student in the school who worried him more. However, it was apparent that he talked with both T and S and was well informed about all that was going on. He had discussed with S and T

the teacher concern about S's rather harsh voice and in his notes he made a point of praising S for moderating this and trying alternative control techniques. He had also asked her to (a) include Maths work within the topic and (b) find ways of stretching the more able children in Maths. T and S had clearly discussed his requests and the teacher had made some suggestions which S put into practice for the tutor's next visit. He was "told off" by everyone when he postponed his visit until the afternoon and missed all the fruits of his suggestions! It should also be noted that his specialist area was Maths and this was reflected in the nature of his advice to the student.

Stage 3

This stage continued in the way described above. The teacher was always anxious to talk about the achievements of S and their interactive discussion continued unabated with excellent results in the classroom. The tutor's notes to the student at this time were very short but his accounts in the tutor discussion illustrated the information he was receiving from T and S about the progress. He believed that S knew what she wanted to achieve and that sometimes she might want to talk about it with someone. He expected that that person would usually be the teacher and if so he wanted her to know how much her contribution was appreciated. If, however, S wanted his advice he would be more than willing to offer it. He tended to be reactive except in the area of Maths where he saw himself as an "enabler". One example is his description of getting permission for the student to sometimes move away from the school Maths scheme.

Tutor: "You have to get right with them socially in a way.....I think you've got to go very gently with something like that. Find out how far the teacher will go. We were very worried that S had to do this Ginn. I said "have a word with the teacher and see" but "no" the message came back "no, I've got to do this Ginn". But the teacher doesn't know you and you don't know the teacher. Once you get to know one another a little better ...I said "it would be nice if S could express herself so long as she sticks to this scheme as a basis" and she was all right after that."

Comment

Relationships

All the participants described their relationships as highly satisfactory. The co-operative relationship between T and S has been described above. The teacher recognised the difficulty of defining roles and especially the expectations of tutors.

T: "Its hard to comment really. It can be such a grey area really. According again to the personalities of both students and incoming



tutors and the particular teaching practice.
If tutors knew the school and the staff and were really assigned to that school for two to three years if possible - in other words like the neighbourhood policeman - to the school- then maybe they would get to know the situation because that helps the student as well.

The characteristics which she liked in the tutor were that he spent considerable time talking to student and teacher and becoming familiar with the school, its curriculum and its environment. The tutor had, initially, been anxious about his reception by the teacher.

Tutor: "I was very happy and very satisfied with this practice which was pleasant because when I went in I thought I would probably have difficulty with one of the teachers (i.e. this one).... as it turned out the teacher I thought I would have difficulty with was very, very supportive and very helpful, suggested things as well as providing materials."

All the participants contributed towards encouraging this good relationship. Some acts of the tutor have already been described. The teacher showed herself very sensitive to the potential difficulties of a student on teaching practice and acted to smooth these.

T: "You have to get a relaxed relationship and that's not always easy. Now students are different in the extent to which they will set up a relationship, some very quiet and reserved, some anxious....I think you've got to level it on your initial assessment, if that could be used as the word, on the type of student you appear to have. There are ways between you, with a stranger, where you can tell whether a person is a rather passive person or very extrovert almost within moments."

She went on to describe this "assessment" process in detail and how she prepared the class and the children to create a welcoming atmosphere. She also talked very seriously about the important role for teachers in preparing new entrants to the profession. The student showed an equal if different sensitivity.

S: "I think I've been really lucky on both teaching practices. I've got on with the tutor and the teacher in both cases and I haven't had any problems....Obviously I've always talked matters over with them and if they've given me advice I've often taken it."

Investigator:

"You've also not taken it though if you haven't chosen to?"

S: "Yes, but I've also said why, the reason for not doing something. I've given the reason why I don't want to do it or why it wouldn't fit into the scheme, or I wanted to cover an area in more detail so I haven't got the time. As

soon as they know why, you know, they've accepted that, talked about it and it was all right."

It was apparent that the student did follow advice or, more usually, adapted it to suit her purposes.

Tutor: "S does listen and takes things in and then adapts them to how she wants."

Student's strengths and weaknesses

The excellent teaching performance of this student was reported by all the participants and has already been referred to. Particularly, she was innovative, extremely competent in putting ideas into practice and with a very well developed sense of purpose. Her reflective attitude to her teaching and her sensitivity were also commented on.

Help and support received by the student

With a very competent student who knows exactly what she wants to do, help needs to be of a particular type. The way that T contributed has already been described. She continually offered ideas, resources and support but was quite willing for the student to choose how she used them. She was always a point of contact for the student to sound out ideas and would often act to encourage an innovation, (e.g. by relieving the student temporarily of some of the members of the class). She herself was not very innovative or imaginative but she re-inforced the student's teaching by taking as much pleasure in her success as S did herself. The tutor, having assessed the capability of the student and her relationship with the teacher tended to stand back as if to allow the development to take its course without his intervention. According to S the tutor was very likeable but did not actually help much e.g.

S: "We talked about what I'd done but it didn't help me really. He didn't give me any ideas but it was nice to get feedback."

The tutor was always very well informed about what was going on and expressed his warm satisfaction to the student. She appreciated this but was more than willing to evaluate her own performance and usually turned to the teacher for an practical help. She also appreciated that the good relationship between teacher and tutor made her teaching practice more pleasant. The tutor's self designation as "enabler" is perhaps the most suitable.

Classification A highly effective protagonist relationship.

Case study 25 U/T2/S2/13

Tutor: notes
Tutor group: 5
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: diary
Teacher: skill sheet
Teacher: discussion

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

The reports from S and T suggested that a warm, friendly relationship developed between them very early on. See investigator's notes:

"Very frequent discussion which is referred to with gratitude by S"

and:

"S is very willing to ask T about anything and very grateful for her support."

The teacher's diary at this point suggested that a lot of her talk was to encourage the student who was having a lot of difficulty with a badly behaved class, e.g. from the diary describing their conversation: "behaviour of various children", "a pep talk", "student depressed today". There was also praise for some excellent lessons and what she described as "chit-chat" about social matters, (e.g. what each did at the weekend). The professional talk was more about the product and conduct of a lesson and "do you need anything?" but there was one comment about an alternative way to organise a session, i.e. with the consent and support of the teacher, the student had introduced his own working practices (grouping the children for Maths).

The tutor, as with S1 in the same school, gave initial attention to "ground rules" rather than specific lesson content and his early comments referred to control techniques and inadequate explanation. He had held extensive discussions with the teacher as well as the student and was well aware of his difficulties. His comments were given attention in the teacher/student discussion, e.g. his reference to inadequate explanation. As with S1 the tutor recommended that the student discuss certain matters with the teacher, (e.g. why a particular boy did not complete his set work). As described in case study 24 the tutor gave attention to the establishment of good social relationships. The teacher also liked to have good social relationships and often referred to social chat in the diary.

Stage 2

An extract from the investigator's notes gives an indication of the nature of this stage:

"S feels very depressed and unhappy with the practice at the moment - he is putting in a great deal of hard work, wants excellent results and is very self critical. The teacher and head teacher are very supportive and feel he is achieving everything he possibly can with a difficult class like this. S has high aspirations about how he wishes to conduct lessons/sessions notably using group

work/discussion/problem solving - the children "play - up " in some sessions. This has been discussed in detail with T. Her role has been to support him by (i) re-assuring him about the frustrating nature of teaching (ii) advising him about dealing with specific difficult children (iii) making suggestions about teaching style, (i.e. adopting more formal class "chalk-talk" teaching. The teacher felt that her direct intervention in the classroom would undermine S's authority."

All of this had been discussed at length with the tutor. He had wanted to know from T whether the student was under-estimating the ability of the children and this was causing discipline problems. In fact, T believed that S was making better provision for individual children than she did.

At this stage both T and the tutor were at pains to assure S of his successes, e.g. the teacher told him that the children liked him and often commented on how enjoyable his lessons were, whereas the tutor often checked on the understanding of the children and was able to monitor their good progress despite their behaviour.

Tutor: "And the kids actually enjoyed that, being like that. I talked to them and again they enjoy what they are doing and I asked them questions on the stuff they had done and without hesitation they were coming back with the right answers."

The tutor, at this stage, gave S some specific suggestions for strategies he might employ, (e.g. eye contact, controlled loss of temper etc.) He had checked with T that all his suggestions were acceptable in the school.

Tutor: "I said "you are too keen on getting through your content and I'm not worried about that. If you want to break off for 5 minutes and let that child have it, that's quite all right by me and T will not mind either.""

Two further points arose from the data at this stage. First was the direct contrast between the teaching styles of T and S, e.g. group discussion sessions as opposed to "chalk and talk", whole class teaching V group teaching in Maths). Related to this was the fact that the teacher's manner of handling the children was not in the behaviour repertoire of the student.

Tutor: "She's got a very good turn of phrase hasn't she ? She can cut the ground from under their feet but he can't."

Secondly, and related to this point, there was a very friendly relationship between T and S with a great deal of talk going on all the time but the talk was not very analytical. Their different styles tended not to be discussed, rather different strategies were put forward to be tried out on a trial and error basis with no discussion of S's ability or inclination to use the strategies. This was a pity for a student who was very analytical about his own teaching.

Finally, it would be wrong to suppose that this could be classified as a weak teaching practice. Both T and the tutor were very impressed by the student's originality,

standard of planning and the results which were being produced. The student had set himself high standards to attain and was depressed that the results were not as good as they could or he thought they should be. The negative aspects tended to dominate discussion.

Stage 3

This stage carried on in a similar way to that described above. The student produced some excellent sessions sometimes marred by the bad behaviour of the children. The work in drama and building a theatre was outstanding. The discussion between T and S which was already extensive seemed to increase. As well as the discussion described in stages 1 and 2, the teacher seemed to be making more suggestions for possible teaching topics and teaching approaches. The student was badly let down by an outside body in connection with an educational visit. The teacher was extremely helpful in salvaging the best from this. Their talk also covered wider aspects of teaching, e.g. school trips, developing a school policy. The tutor had two main emphases during this stage. The first was to boost the confidence of the student. He set out to notice good planning, excellent displays, effective teaching, e.g.

Tutor: "Last week we had a smashing lesson. They were building these theatres and they were really totally motivated, thoroughly engrossed in what they were doing and the concentration was excellent for a long period of time."

This gave the tutor a chance to praise the student and to list the skills in the different curriculum areas which were being developed, (e.g. using electric circuits, proportion, ratio etc.).

The second theme for the tutor was to get the student to experiment with the control tactics which he had suggested and cleared with the teacher, (e.g. the use of sarcasm with the children), e.g.

Tutor: "...the problem that S has got...if one wants to call it a problem...is developing strategies to deal with the disruptive pupils he's got in that class - which he's got more than his fair share - while remembering he's got an awful lot of bright children in that class as well. So I am particularly looking out to see if he is implementing any of the strategies that I've put forward. I've not said do this or do that, I've said well sometimes this works, sometimes that works. Try this, try that, I don't care whether it works or whether it doesn't as long as you try it and then you find out what is the best one for you."

He regularly checked with T and S to see if his strategies had been tried. He also looked for opportunities to model them.

Tutor: "I've been trying to get him to "jump on" fairly quickly and I have been hoping some-

body would do it next to me....so today
I sat at the teacher's table and I was hoping
somebody here would do it but unfortunately
they didn't so I couldn't do it myself. T did
say he had been trying some strategies with
limited success, but at least he's trying."

Comment

Relationships

The friendly, supportive, co-operative relationship within this trio has been described. The teacher saw this as an important responsibility, e.g.

T: "You have to strike up a relation with them
....I think the teacher's got to take
the lead really because the student comes
in really in trepidation and awe."

and: "Its down to the teacher because you've
got to put yourself in that situation....
You're out there to teach them as
much as you can."

and: "You've also got to be good with them in
the staffroom when other members of
staff are there."

The teacher tried to put these ideas into practice and the student was full of praise for her help and support. They became good friends.

The tutor also went out of his way to establish good relationships in the school. He believed that a good social relationship was an aspect of an effective professional relationship (see also case study 24) and he tried to establish both. Referring to this tutor the teacher said:

T: "You can send him back any day, (i.e. to
supervise in the school)"

She was very impressed with the time he was prepared to spend in discussion as well as with his concern for the student. She compared him favourably with previous tutors in the school who had not made efforts to talk to the teachers.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

Both teacher and tutor praised S for his meticulous planning, innovative ideas, determination, understanding of the children's needs and abilities as well as by the high standard of work produced by the children. On more than one occasion the teacher compared S's teaching favourably against her own, (e.g. his provision for ability levels in Maths, his group work in Drama). The tutor was disappointed that S did not, in his opinion, make a more concerted effort to try out the tutor's suggested control techniques. The teacher was much more inclined to judge the "bad" days as "a fact of life of teaching". Both recognised that this was an abnormally difficult class.

Help and support received by the student

The input of the teacher has been described above. She felt that the teacher's role was, definitely, one of giving

practical advice and "tips for teachers".

T: "Its not how to teach but all the little tricks of the trade."

and: "Tutors really are down to the theory. We are the ones with the practice all the time."

At first, she was supportive with encouragement and equipment but as time went on she began to make more suggestions about ideas and teaching method. This came in response to the student's difficulties. She and the student were very different indeed in personality and teaching style. She was extrovert with a preference for class teaching and was able to control the children by "cutting the ground from under their feet". She was very sarcastic and was able to impose her authority, (e.g. from the investigator's notes "T says she will have several weeks of "hard writing work"to settle them down - a phrase expressed with dour determination"). The student was quiet and unassuming with a wish to give the children responsibility for their own learning by introducing discussion and group decision making. It was only slowly that the importance and implications of these differences in style were realised by the participants. They could have been a more influential factor in the type of discussion that took place. As it was, T was a great support to S in a difficult situation, especially as time went on and he was extremely grateful for that support.

He was also grateful for the good relationship between the teacher and the tutor and for the praise which the tutor offered. However, he was not so happy with the suggested discipline strategies which he felt were out of touch with this particular set of children and so were not appropriate to try out. In fact, he felt they would have caused more problems than they solved and so he was reluctant to try them despite pressure from the tutor. Eventually he began to realise that an added difficulty was that he, himself, would not be able to implement the suggested strategies. However, he did not attempt to discuss any of this with the tutor.

The advice he received tended to come in a form of ideas or strategies to try out on a trial and error basis when in fact he was a very reflective person.

Because T felt that her influence would be disruptive to the student in the classroom she did not actually see him in practice or ever act as a model for him or team teach with him in order to experiment with different teaching approaches.

Classification A warm and friendly protagonist relationship.

Case study 26 V/T/S/9

Tutor group: 6

Tutor: summary sheets

Teacher: discussion

Student: discussion group

Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

The evidence from the teacher and the student suggested an absolute minimum of interaction between the two. The teacher had been teaching another class for the whole of the first week and had left the student alone with her class. S had tried to follow what she understood to be the teacher's organisation without the teacher being there. She admitted finding this difficult. The teacher had not seen any of the student's plans. She said she would like to see them but had not asked. She was also unhappy about a comment the tutor had put in her notes, i.e. that the noisy children were not the fault of the student. The teacher said she wanted to discuss this with the tutor but had not made any attempt to speak to her.

The tutor's account presented a very depressing picture.

Tutor: "I found the whole thing very depressing."

She went on to describe what she saw in the classroom as "just terrible" and then "the most depressing aspect of it all," e.g.

Tutor: "They (the children) didn't know what they were doing, the quality of the work was just terrible....they didn't take any care as to whether they actually lined their rulers up....What distressed me was that S seemed only able to sit on top of it. I never heard her say to a child any remark at all which implied that there was any other way to do it."

This seemed to be the picture during the whole of the first stage but it was exacerbated by (i) no evidence of a relationship between T and S, (ii) no concern on the part of the teacher or head teacher about what was going on in that classroom (iii) lack of communication between teacher, student and head teacher (iv) lack of communication between teacher and tutor. Examples of (i) have already been described. Referring to (ii) neither teacher nor headteacher, at this stage, expressed any concern about the student's teaching except that the headteacher asked for a photocopy of the student's plans to put in his record. He complained to the tutor that S had not prepared lesson plans when in fact she had. She had not been able to explain where they were in her file because nobody in school had asked her to.

Referring to (iv) the tutor had not, initially, been able to talk to the teacher "because she was too harassed I think to say anything to me". When they were able to meet there was an uncomfortable atmosphere.

Tutor: "I don't really think sometimes she understood what I was saying, about targets and organisation and stuff like that. She agreed with everything I said but I had the nasty feeling - I had the horrid feeling when I came out that I really

ought to, be a lot more careful with that lady because she seemed to be very accepting and helpful and I had a sneaky feeling it may come back in my face."

and "She really thinks I'm doing things to be unkind or offensive. I don't think she really wants to engage in a level of discussion which I think is necessary to get that student doing what she is capable of doing but isn't doing at the moment."

At this stage the tutor believed the student had good ideas but was gauging the level of the children's ability wrongly.

Tutor: "I think she has problems with actual teaching because she hasn't gauged their level at all accurately. She is full of super ideas and her own knowledge and her own desire to teach is very strong. But it hardly shows off - it is the most difficult thing to get your finger on. It is a vicious circle that she is in because she is not presenting appropriate tasks, therefore the children are not working. Because they are not working they are messing about. Because they are messing about she is harsh and cold with them and none of it is gelling."

Unfortunately, during these early stages the tutor did not make an opportunity for discussion with the student because of her other college commitments.

Stage 2

At the beginning of this stage the situation was similar to that described above except that now the teacher and headteacher were covertly monitoring the student's plans.

Tutor: "What happens is that the headteacher and the class teacher keep quite a close eye on the student's plans but then say things like "I could tell that wasn't going to work" but obviously they haven't said it to the student."

On one visit the tutor took half the class to give the student a chance to concentrate her attention on the other half.

During the school's half term the tutor was able, for the first time, to speak to the student at some length, "to tell her she is making a pig's ear of it". She made plans with the student for reorganising the class and she enlisted the headteacher to discuss the student's planning with her.

Tutor: "So what I've done now is to engineer a situation where the head has now agreed to spend the first half hour of every Monday morning going through the student's plans with the student."

She was now approaching the headteacher first, because she felt that T was still unwilling to take any responsibility and secondly, because she was beginning to pick up discord

between T and the headteacher.

Tutor: "I also picked up very slightly last time a very veiled - I still think it was there - um - criticism of the class teacher's way of working from the headteacher and I just wonder whether - I, I have a horrid feeling that its in several people's best interests that the student doesn't do particularly well."

In fact, the classroom re-organisation suggested by the tutor to the student was in response to an initial suggestion from the headteacher who had criticised, to the tutor, the student's way of working in the classroom. It was only later that it was made clear that S had taken over the teacher's way of working.

As a result of these arrangements the situation in school became easier. The class teacher knew almost nothing about what was going on in the classroom because she felt that her presence would be "threatening to the student". However she felt that she missed the class very much and that the student was not "loving enough" with them. The headteacher took his responsibility seriously and even did some team teaching with S.

Stage 3

The action described above continued to have a beneficial effect at the beginning of this stage. However, things began to deteriorate again.

Tutor: "...almost nothing seemed to be working and I suppose the lowest level of not working was her management of the children and her interaction with the children....she didn't seem to recognise that the children were not doing what she asked them to do."

The headteacher had now given up his new, supportive role because of the pressure of other school activities. The teacher continued to make no contribution.

During discussion the tutor was very much concerned with the role of the teacher during teaching practice and, initially, had recommended S to try and watch the teacher.

Tutor: "That's made me think of something actually, which I feel a bit embarrassed about in a way - the construction that I realise I have of what teaching practice is about in this respect, and that is that I always hope that my student will have a competent, supportive, self-examining class teacher. Not because it takes the heat off me, because it does, but also I think that's where the student's greatest help comes from and I see my role as topping up really if that ideal isn't approached to some extent."

and "Yes, and I think that's what I mean by saying that I hope that the student would get with a teacher who can be and is prepared to be a genuine significant other...."

this teacher is failing in this other role
and I don't really know how to react.

The tutor had also begun to be irritated by the complete lack of response of the student. Her attitude was always one of complete acceptance with no apparent opinion of her own.

Tutor: "Its interesting, you feel a trigger -
what did you say, exasperated. I've got
to be very careful because it arouses some
vindictive reactions in me. I want to prod
the student to see if anything happens....
It doesn't seem to matter what I say
to the student she doesn't react, she
simply accepts whatever I say to her and I
think if I was extremely rude and hurtful
she would sit and accept it."

The teaching practice ended in a state of anxiety and frustration.

Comment

Relationships

The difficulties in relationships between the participants have been described above. However, the attitude of the student did not become apparent until after the end of the practice when she discussed it for the first time in the student discussion group, when talking about those factors which help towards good relationships.

S: "I think if you feel that they are interested
and you're not being used on some occasions
really, because I very rarely saw my teacher.
I never thought she was any help or very
interested....she had her coat on at 3.35
and would be out of the school door
before I'd even finished the lesson."

It also became clearer that the student did not find it easy to initiate discussion herself.

S: "I think if they open the conversation its
more likely that you can discuss problems
you've had anyway. You need to have an opening."

It appeared from the discussion that the student did try to follow the tutor's suggestions but unsuccessfully because of the situation in the school. She had not explained this to the tutor. It is hard to know why not. The reserved nature of the student has been referred to but also the tutor was rarely in school long enough for discussion to take place.

S:time was always pressing....I think
it was because she (tutor) had other
commitments."

As well as this S felt under pressure to please different people.

S: "I felt as if I was trying to please three
different people. It wasn't just the tutor
and the teacher it was the headteacher as
well."

It seemed that the headteacher was making demands which

she, a student, could not possibly realise. He wanted her to change the teacher's organisation (of which he did not approve) but as soon as S moved children T moved them back again.

The picture which emerged was one of unease and mistrust with a lack of time to exchange views in a frank and open way. Probably the least destructive relationship was that between the tutor and the headteacher who very slowly developed a relationship approaching mutual respect. Unfortunately, because of the pressure on the time of these two it did not work for the benefit of the student.

Student's strengths and weaknesses

The evidence above shows the weaknesses of this student in this particular classroom. The tutor reported weakness at the very simplest level of classroom management. This was related to the hostile attitude in the classroom and probably to the student's inability to respond to the needs of individual children. The student also appeared to be reserved and gave an impression of lack of awareness of her own difficulties which the tutor found quite irritating. However, the student had previously done a very successful teaching practice and, in fact, was aware of her problems but lacking in confidence to discuss them.

Help and support received by the student

It has been pointed out that the student received no help from the teacher and, in fact, at times the teacher acted against the best interests of S, (e.g. moving children). As a result of suggestions from the tutor, S attempted to use T as a model for providing differentially for the wide ability range in this mixed age class. In fact, T did not make differential provision and the behaviour of the children for the teacher was comparable with their behaviour for the student.

The tutor while making an analysis in the early stages did not act to discuss this analysis with the student. This was partly because of lack of time but partly because of the initial judgement she had made of the student.

Tutor: "The situation I was dissatisfied with was
.....where the teacher wasn't helpful
in the day to day situation and neither
was I. I don't think ...at least to
begin with, I didn't latch on to it quickly
enough."

and "It isn't until you've got the feel of the
thing that you can start to define rightly
or wrongly what a student should move towards.
And sometimes it takes so long - sometimes it
takes me so long to latch on to what is
actually happening in a school as opposed to
what the head implies is happening that you
realise you have missed the boat - that you
should have intervened with the student at a
much more fundamental level - much earlier in
the practice."

The tutor (see stage 3) saw her role as "topping up" the

teacher. With an apparently unco-operative and probably incompetent teacher she did could not decide quickly how to act.

Tutor: "If I'd realised the way things worked I think I'd have gone in....have gone in and taught that class with S."

In other words she would have replaced the role of the teacher if she had realised the pressing necessity for that. In retrospect she believed that S was not the independent, competent student "capable of finding her own way" that she (tutor) had imagined but in fact that she was a student who needed a model.

Tutor: "I think it was a dreadful experience for her....because I now realise through force of circumstance that she had no model on which to base her actions. I thought that she had the where-with-all in herself to manage because she'd been good in other situations - that she could transfer some of those skills. It turns out that she couldn't and she didn't have anybody to show her the way."

After half-term, when the tutor had spoken to the student and negotiated a new arrangement with the headteacher, there was a temporary improvement. However, this lasted only as long as the headteacher had the time to discuss the plans and their implementation and to work in the classroom with the student, i.e. himself taking on the role that an effective class teacher may have fulfilled (just as the tutor had felt, in retrospect, to be necessary).

Classification Clear evidence of the need for a teacher/pupil relationship which did not materialise.

Case study 27 W/T/S/14

Tutor: notes
Tutor group: 5
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: diary
Teacher: skill sheet

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

The general impression during this stage was of a very competent student working closely with a co-operative class teacher. See investigator's notes:

"T asks about plans, discusses whether they will work out and then says go ahead."

and:

"T very impressed with the morning's work - she points out the detailed planning."

and:

"They seem to manage to find plenty of time for discussion and the teacher had a list of thing in her book which they had talked about. She was using the skill list as a basis for that....It seemed to me that a good working relationship was being developed."

However, this picture masked an initial time of considerable tension. During the first week the class teacher had been critical of the student on a number of counts, i.e. that she was "teaching to the middle"; that she was not maintaining the important "skill learning"; that she was not finding time to hear the children read. The student for her part had found the class teacher's approach very unimaginative. When this feeling was coupled with the teacher's criticisms the student had got in touch with her tutor in a very distressed state, convinced that she would not be able to implement any of her ambitious schemes in that classroom. The tutor reacted by reassuring the student about the value of her schemes and about their compatibility with the teacher's requirements. She also spent time reassuring the teacher about the nature of the research project and T's role in it. Her next comments on the summary sheets were optimistic:

"Uneasy relationship resolved. T and S have good rapport now. T sure of S's ability. S clear about her own ability and progress."

She also described the teacher as being "very pleased with S's progress - felt she needed little help." At this time the teacher was also sensitive to S's request that she be allowed to start the session without the teacher being in the room.

The tutor's notes to the student reflected her own satisfaction with S's progress. She picked out specific elements of the student's teaching for reinforcement and, particularly, commented on the fact that the student was managing to hear the children read. The teacher was reassured that there was a shared understanding about some important priorities. The tutor's notes illustrated range and detail and were supplemented by lengthy discussions with T and S. The discussion was often initiated by the

student asking for specific advice and reassurance.

Stage 2

There was every indication here of the success of the practice. See investigator's notes:

"Impression of a wonderful classroom. T completely satisfied with student's progress - was full of praise and encouragement".

The tutor commented on the summary sheets "T has little to say except praise of work undertaken."

These were just some examples of the participants' reactions to S's teaching. The tutor was also aware of the change in the working relationship between T and S. This had been the subject of an extended discussion between them. The tutor summarised this discussion on the summary sheet:

"Formal discussion may be counter productive, i.e. looking for something to discuss may highlight non-existent problems." This discussion led to their thinking about a different sort of relationship, which involved an equal exchange of ideas. At the same time the teacher reported going into the classroom to "hear readers" but just listening to the lesson because she was so interested. She had listed many ideas from the student's work which she wanted to try out for herself. She made use of the skills list to evaluate one of the lessons she had watched. Formal arrangements made to discuss planning were no longer necessary, instead there was spontaneous discussion of those aspects of the student's teaching which interested them both.

At this stage the tutor's notes were full of praise but she herself was beginning to question the role she should be taking when everything was progressing so well. Her contributions to the tutor discussion illustrated her belief that each student was different and that supervision behaviour should reflect this.

Tutor: "You couldn't be anything other than different with different students or the whole thing would be ridiculous."

Stage 3

This stage showed the same excellent performance of the student and the maintenance of good relationships within the trio. The stage was characterised by the issue raised by the tutor at the end of stage 2, i.e. what was the next step. One possibility was to branch out to other aspects of teaching, e.g. giving more attention to such things as record keeping. However, the student seemed to be working so hard already that to ask her to do anything else would have seemed unreasonable. Related to this, in the eyes of the tutor was S's lack of confidence.

Tutor: "Well I feel in S's case that confidence is a problem. I mean although she is aware that she is doing well, her confidence is still not 100% I would say.....Also I detected that if I pushed her any further it would start to cause her stress - I felt that anyway....."

Quite honestly I don't know how she's got the time to do what she's doing now.

The tutor's aim was to encourage S's confidence so that she could become more "resilient and flexible". This, in fact, seemed to happen. S became much more open to critical discussion. One particular example came as a result of a discussion between the teacher and the tutor. The teacher felt that there was too much emphasis on Art/expressive work and not enough on what the teacher called "facts". This was the sort of criticism, which, initially, would have upset and worried the student. This time she and the tutor discussed what the teacher meant, which was not clear to them, and then planned some work along those lines. Another anxiety of the teacher was the work associated with the school Maths scheme. The student wanted to respond to this but still to associate it with her own way of working. It was in consultation with the tutor that she managed to do this, i.e. reconciling her approach with that of the teacher.

Tutor: "Yes that's what I meant really when I said I wanted to get more interested after half term talking with the children so that I could actually pin-point things that they had learned. I have not really had the opportunity to do that."

and later

"I talk to the children. I ask them questions about what they have been doing."

As a result she was able to comment in S's notes on such things as

"Good beginning - children interested from the start. They found each activity valuable, and did not need to "envy" another group's task." and "I have yet to see a bored face in this classroom". This was as well as comments on the progress of particular children.

By this time the teacher was satisfied that S was using the Maths scheme in an appropriate way but she had some reservations about "the children's reading" which the tutor did not manage to allay.

Comment

Relationships

The teacher and the student in this classroom were very different in their teaching style. The teacher put great emphasis on "bread and butter teaching" while the student was extremely creative with a flair for artistic work. Each was very independent in her thinking and in many ways the student was sensitive and lacking in confidence. There was a considerable potential for difficult relationships. The development of the co-operative working relationship has been described above. All the participants contributed to this good working relationship.

The student illustrated the pressure on any student in wanting to do what s/he feels is right but wanting to keep on the right side of "assessors".

S: "Because even if you get on with somebody

and if you've got an idea and you know that it isn't what they do, you put it off, because you know exactly what's going to be said when you've done it....you don't like making mistakes because they'll point it out to you."

She felt that there was pressure within the school.

S: "Yes there were things I would love to have done but couldn't."

However, the tact of S and the tutor and the forbearance and tolerance of the teacher were important elements in reaching a compromise.

S: "You've got to say, I realise what you are expecting but this is what's expected of me, and come to some kind of compromise about it rather than going in and saying "I'm going to do this.""

and "Sometimes it works if you say "no I don't think that will work because..." and validate why you are saying it."

It was apparent that the tutor not only gave the student confidence in her point of view but also helped with advice about strategies to get that point of view across.

Tutor (to other tutors in the discussion group)

"I don't disagree with you (i.e. about doing and saying what you believe in) but I believe you have to help students develop the strategies to negotiate their ideas."

The tutor paid great tribute to the tolerance of the teacher towards an outstanding and independently minded student who was introducing a quite different manner of working into the classroom.

Tutor: "I think that teacher was extremely tolerant actually. She could have been very, very threatened indeed but she was really impressed by what S was doing....She was a very special teacher to have taken that threat. I don't know how well I would have reacted in her situation."

Student's strengths and weaknesses

This teaching practice was described by teacher and tutor as outstanding. The teacher did feel that there was an under emphasis on "bread and butter" teaching and the tutor had a concern that S should grow in confidence and the ability to accept criticism. The tutor's final written comments suggest that she was satisfied.

"S grew in confidence throughout the practice and was thus able to see suggestions as a bonus and not as a criticism. She developed a genuine respect for the teacher with whom she shared ideas on an equal basis."

Help and support received by the student

The kind of help this student was offered and received changed during the practice. The teacher in her anxiety to do justice to the research project worried very much about what she considered to be her lack of input confronted with

a very competent student. However, after the discussion during stage 2, she began to work as a colleague with the student rather than attempting to be an instructor. Referring to T's input the tutor wrote:

"Most conscientious in her approach to the practice and to the research being undertaken. I would suggest' that she sees it as an equal working partnership and that she would perhaps have been reticent in suggesting this at the outset."

She was ready to listen to the student's plans and showed spontaneous praise for the good results. Later she was able, via the tutor, to feed in more specific suggestions. Both tutor and teacher gave the student "space" to try out her ideas.

S: "I found that I got the assumption that everything was agreed with but really the class teacher and the tutor were just seeing how it went. They told me after it had gone all right that they wondered whether it would have done."

Investigator:

"Really do you think that was good?"

S: "Well I was annoyed - but yet it would only have put me off."

It was typical of this tutor that she made careful judgements of students before she would be prepared to support a risk like that, and she was always available if things did not go as well as expected.

Another important role of the tutor in this particular situation was as a listener.

S: "Yes sometimes there is something I HAVE to talk about and the tutor is there. You can't talk to anybody else they are all too busy. Its nice to have somebody to talk to who won't go glassy eyed. Often not just talk about the lesson but anything, everything- your wall, the children, education."

This function was filled admirably by the tutor for this student with excellent results.

Classification An effective protagonist relationship sustained by the sensitive actions of the tutor.

Case study 28 T1/S1/2

Tutor: notes
Tutor group: 6
Tutor: summary sheets
Teacher: skill sheet

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

In this nursery class there was a very tight structure but within that, a lot of flexibility to respond to the very young children. This required regular, on-the-spot planning to co-ordinate the work of teacher, nursery nurse and student. Within these ad hoc planning sessions the teacher took the dominant role, which was prescriptive in expectations for the student. However, there was a pleasant relaxed and friendly atmosphere between these three adults and the planning framework which they used was the one which was also used by the college. The investigator's notes read:

"I get the impression of a very co-operative team even if the teacher is quite dominant. S seems happy and satisfied with her role in the proceedings."

and

"Conversation is full, frequent and collaborative, associated a great deal with this administration, but this in turn is related to the needs of the children - their development and moods....with respect to planning, the discussion is ongoing because they are always talking about it."

The tutor's notes praised such things as the "range of activities provided for the children" and the "super story" and offered very specific advice about balancing activities and not becoming too involved with specific groups, so that others escaped notice.

Her contribution to the tutor discussion was dominated by her attempts to understand the role of the teacher and her relationship to the student - particularly the teacher's request that S should be more assertive.

Tutor: "T is very authoritative with a very outgoing personality, the teacher of the class and the student is very lacking in confidence and so T has already discussed it with her last week. She (T) felt she (S) wasn't being assertive enough, but in a sense it is very difficult for her to be assertive in that situation when the teacher herself is very dominant and has remained so - I think because she remains with her in the classroom most of the time."

She went on to explain that there were a number of adults in the classroom, i.e. teacher, nursery nurse, parents and that "the student found it difficult to see her role".

The tutor was also pre-occupied with whether she really wanted the student to be assertive in the way the teacher suggested.

Tutor: "It seems that the teacher was worried because if a child said it didn't want to do some-

thing S would just leave it at that and the teacher's attitude was that she should say "come on, you are going to do it because I have said so". Well I wouldn't necessarily have done that."

The tutor went on to describe how she would have involved the child by working with her/him. However, the tutor also described the T/S relationship as "very close and supportive" and did not want to interfere with that. In fact, she was aware that even if she had wanted it, her influence would probably have been very small at this stage. Instead, she encouraged the student to take a more global view of what was happening in the whole classroom (see tutor's teaching practice notes) and not to confine herself to working with a single group. She also spent a considerable time discussing the general running of the nursery with the teacher and she took the trouble to thank the teacher for the instructional role she was playing in helping the student.

Stage 2

There were stages in the situation at this stage expressed in slightly different ways by the participants. After a period of very close co-operative planning and working, the teacher reported leaving the student more on her own. She continued to check up on what S was going to do and sometimes commented on it and there was still a lot of co-operation at the planning stage. As well as discussing planning they talked in detail about individual children and their progress. The teacher rejected an evaluative role although she had commented on story telling and S's lack of assertiveness and she was prepared to discuss anything S asked about. The discussion of the skill sheet between teacher and investigator was very productive and raised certain issues in the mind of the teacher which she felt she could easily discuss with S in a non-threatening way, (e.g. being less directive in Science work; use of explanation; following the children's enthusiasms). She recognised her own frustration at the "slowness" of the student in developing a topic and the fact that she (S) was a perfectionist. This was one of her reasons for wanting to spend less time in the classroom so that the student could develop her own style and work from her own initiative. The tutor also referred to this changing relationship. Initially, she had felt less able to contribute because of the tight collaborative relationship between S and T which made the teacher quite protective.

Tutor: " I felt less able to contribute in that situation....I felt very much the time before last that I was in the way..... But last week when I went in I didn't feel in the way but that was partly because the teacher has now moved out of the classroom so I could work with S in the classroom."

and "No it didn't really worry me but I felt that feeling between them that if I came in I might say something they didn't agree with

or I might maybe criticise, which inhibited me a little bit....although I like the teacher, she's great."

This last phrase is important in understanding this tutor's view. She was full of praise for the teacher's support and had a lot of respect for her teaching. However, she was anxious to see the student take her own decisions and explore her own style.

Tutor: "I felt now that there was some student initiative rather than teacher initiative. They are still collaborating but the student will now take the lead more openly in the classroom....and she is enjoying having the whole class responsibility and she was telling me herself of the developments she wants - she has organised a trip and it was all her own doing."

During this stage the tutor's notes were full of praise (e.g. for "a lovely learning environment") but very detailed (e.g. about use of free play; observation of children's learning; use of certain equipment). She also put some emphasis on evaluation of certain aspects of the teaching.

Stage 3

All the participants expressed a great deal of satisfaction at this stage. The teacher reported that the student was taking the initiative and was much more assertive. The student had also taken on the responsibility for directing the nursery nurse trainee. Both T and S reported that the most significant change was in S's confidence. They still planned together but S took most of the responsibility. S believed that her confidence came from (i) the trust of the other members of the adult team who now saw her as the initiator of action (ii) the fact that the teacher was confident to leave her. She described long discussions with both T and the tutor, suggesting that she went to the teacher for advice and the tutor for approval. According to her report the tutor made her think by asking her lots of questions, (e.g. about the play areas and what they would lead onto.) The student began to talk about her own teaching style, recognising how she was like the teacher, (e.g. her attitude to the children) and how she was different (in personality and its effects on her teaching). This also influenced whether she would discuss an issue with the tutor or the teacher. She was also recognising their distinctive approaches, i.e. that she did not always agree with the way the teacher did things. They did not report discussing these differences as a trio but she was able to extend her view of teaching by discussing some of these differences with the tutor. However, it seemed that by this time the tutor had gained the confidence of the teacher (i) because she no longer felt it necessary to be protective and (ii) because the teacher began to ask the tutor's advice and opinion about general teaching issues, including matters which the tutor had raised with the student.

Also at this stage the tutor was able to look back and recognise the student's gain in confidence and the environment which had supported her.

Tutor: "S had this confidence problem, although she didn't have this difficult situation (i.e. that another student had had), so she was able to get her own boost, her own feedback if you like by the teacher supporting her, being constructive with her, so she has found she has developed from this and then the teacher has supported that by withdrawing more."

The tutor reported that it was the teacher's reading of the skill sheet which encouraged her to withdraw more, because it helped her to realise that she was not allowing the student to do certain things.

The tutor also recognised that the student was more aware of her (tutor) as evaluator and this made her a little uneasy about raising issues.

Tutor: "I've felt all along that she hasn't had the relationship with me, because I think I'm new. I think I have got to know her very well but I think she is still nervous to raise things for fear for some reason that I would be critical....I think she is very thoughtful but isn't comfortable raising points."

However referring to the teaching practice she said:

Tutor: "I feel very happy with what she is doing."

Comments

Relationships

The picture which emerged was of a very close professional and friendly relationship between T and S with the tutor, initially, excluded. However the tutor was aware of this and without in any way trying to damage the relationship she gained the confidence of both T and S. What teacher, tutor or investigator did not fully appreciate was the potential pressure which the student felt about the trio relationship.

S: "Well its a lot easier if you know exactly what they want from you. You know rather than being just sort of vague about it....If they say "now look this is what I want you to do, this is what I expect from you."

and "Because every tutor is different and every teacher is different. You know they've got different ways of doing things....so if they set it out at the beginning its much better."

and "On TP in a way we have got to suck up to the teacher and to the tutor, and you've GOT to and if you don't then the result isn't as good - and its sad, it shouldn't be like that - you shouldn't have to but you just do."

and "...if my tutor mentioned something or said to me you know it would be good for you to do that, then if I knew she was coming

in say Thursday of the next week then I felt I had to get that thing done by Thursday.... and in the nursery it was a case of, you know, she had to be able to see it."

With this sort of anxiety it was not surprising that the student was wary with the tutor and lacking in confidence. Perhaps what was surprising was that the relationship developed and remained so good and that the tutor gained the respect of the student.

S: "My tutor was really helpful all the way through and she was really good."
and "My tutor gave me a lot of ideas, you know, that I could pick up on and just you know, she'd mention something and I'd say "oh yes" and my ideas would come out as we were talking. I'd say "I'll try that". It was good in that way."

This attitude was especially significant because the student could just as easily have played the tutor of against the teacher as she had in a previous practice.

S: "You know in a lot of cases it doesn't do you as a student any harm if the teacher and the tutor don't get on".
and "I'm not playing them off against each other in the sense...like thatbut you can sort of relate....if you think the teacher's doing something wrong and you know that the tutor, you know, agrees with you....and the same with the teacher. I know that sounds awful siding with whoever is there at the time but I don't know if it does you any harm."

Student's strengths and weaknesses

All the participants were highly satisfied with the student on this teaching practice. She was extremely competent and with increasing confidence was able to take the initiative in directing other adults in the classroom as well as planning the curriculum for the children and introducing new ways of working.

Help and support received by the student

The help which this student received has been described in some detail above. In summary:

She was able to take over a well organised class by working closely with the class teacher in an instructional role in planning and implementation. With the increasing confidence and competence of the student she became to be taken into the planning and teaching team as partner who shared the views of the other team members, (i.e. teacher and nursery nurse). At both these stages the tutor was less influential. As the teacher withdrew from the classroom the tutor took a more dominant role. Her clear understanding of the class and her wide experience helped her to encourage the student to examine her teaching in a reflective way. This was a role which the teacher did not chose to take on so their discussion was rarely as a trio. However, the

teacher made note of the tutor's suggestions to the extent that she enquired further about them. The good relationship between the participants ensured that the student was prepared to take in both perspectives and this worked to her great advantage as she was prepared to agree.

Classification Teacher pupil > collaborator> protagonist

Case study 29 T2/S2/14

Tutor: notes
Tutor group: 5
Tutor: summary sheets

Student: discussion group
Investigator: 3 visits

Stage 1

The student in this school was placed in a very difficult situation. He was in a school in an inner city area with some of the difficulties associated with that sort of environment. He was working with a supply teacher in a situation where two classes of children split into three groups were being taught by 2 other teachers and the student. The situation was so complex that the investigator did not follow the explanation and the supply teacher was uncertain about it. On the positive side, the school staff were a cohesive caring group with a very positive attitude to the children and to their role in the training of teachers.

Within this system the teacher and the student were working very closely together. An extract from the investigator's notes gives some idea of this relationship.

"It is important to realise that the teacher is new as well and is also learning about the children and the system. Their conversation is a great deal about individual children and what is best for them, mostly in terms of personality and the best way of handling them (some of these children were quite disturbed). This seems to take precedence. T refers to a lot of disruption, e.g. use of the Hall; mix up over TV and such problems not of the student's making. The two seem to deal with these problems together. SOME discussion about planning but not much, e.g. S reported their discussion about Art/Craft and joint teaching. I got the impression of quite a lot of talk going on spontaneously about organisation and personality, (i.e. of the children). No comments on S's teaching."

The tutor knew the school very well and was well aware of the difficulties, which she had discussed with the headteacher. She did not, however, know the class teacher and took every opportunity to get to know her in a social way. She described the teacher at this stage as supportive but qualified this with "mothering" and "protective". Her notes to the student gave a lot of praise for interesting ideas and his good relationship with the children. However, from the very beginning she was pressing the student to evaluate more analytically, e.g.

"Evaluation needs much more constructive detail. You are not asking why often enough, only what is happening."

In the discussion, the tutor stressed the importance of what a student can learn from a situation however difficult it is.

Tutor: "You look for what students learn from a situation regardless of whether they have been able to make any changes. They might still have actually learnt from the situation they have got in front of them but can't make any changes really because of the situation."

It was in this light that she viewed the student's progress.

Stage 2

There was an important change of direction at this stage. The tutor had become increasingly anxious about what she considered to be the lack of progress of the student, specifically the lack of student input into the curriculum and the lack of group work. The notes referred to the need for more specific planning and evaluation. The tutor was also uncertain about how to judge the role which the teacher was taking, see tutor summary sheet.

"Teacher and student have a good relationship BUT is the student too dependent or the teacher too supportive?"

She was also worried about what she saw as the student's "passive attitude". The tutor was beginning to put some pressure on the student and described her relationship with him as "strained" and her relationship with the teacher as "friendly but with disagreement". The disagreement was about their assessment of the student - the tutor concerned about his lack of input, the teacher recognising some deficiencies but blaming the "system" for these.

Coinciding with the tutor's concern about the student was the school's concern about the system in operation in these two classes. This system had only been maintained at the request of the other class teacher but now all were completely dissatisfied with its implementation. The tutor was involved in discussion with the head teacher and deputy head teacher about the system in general as well as about any adverse effects it might have upon the student. It was decided to make the two classes autonomous and this led to a lot of discussion about a new form of organisation within the class. The investigator visited the school at this time and the student's complete lack of participation in this discussion was noticeable. The tutor put in extra visits at this time and praised the student's efforts as well as joining in the teaching. She made a particular list of requirements which she had for the student and arranged to discuss them in detail with him over half term. At this point the tutor assessed the situation as follows:

"Problem as I see it:

(1) Has been unable until last week to assess children's level in other than a superficial way.

(2) Student has concentrated on two (highest ability) groups and planning here is generally OK, although insufficient detail supplied in file. Other two groups not really catered for adequately.

(3) Outcome of above is that I am unable to trace development and would suggest student is too.

Tendency is to provide one-off situations which although interesting and valuable are not really showing progression."

Again, in the discussion group, the tutor emphasised the importance of what the student was learning not what he might achieve in the available time.

Stage 3

The results of this change were quite dramatic. On her summary sheet the tutor reported:

"To student - Praise for change in atmosphere and putting into practice suggestions made - encouragement high.

From student - much more forthcoming - positive. Is realising possibilities of new situation and the problems which were masked by the old system."

The student was now able to voice the despondency he had felt at the idea of the change. He admitted that he had felt under tremendous pressure from the tutor and that this was only alleviated by the input she was prepared to put in and by his trust in her concern for his learning. By his account his previous passivity was caused by the "certain knowledge that I will not be able to influence any decisions". As a result of the "new regime" there was a change in the teacher /student behaviour. See investigator's notes:

"T now works as an auxiliary to S, i.e. "what do you want me (T) to do?". S takes the responsibility and T helps him e.g. by supervising a group; listening to reading etc. Their conversation is still continuous. T says she will often comment on something as it is happening but in a very informal and spontaneous way. According to S she has been particularly helpful with the slower group whom he did not know very well."

The tutor became aware that she had underestimated the difficulties:

Tutor: "Now I realised that I had under-estimated the problems he has got in that school so I admitted it....partly by things that the teacher said and partly because now I can see him working the new system and the old system has gone. The problems inherent in the old system were virtually, for a student impossible."

During the tutor discussion this tutor was very reluctant to describe students as weak or strong. She saw them only as students in different situations.

Tutor: "What I think I am looking at now with S which is different from (another student) is his ability to cope with the situation he is confronted with rather than specifically how well he is teaching this child or that child because the situation in that class is so difficult."

During this final stage of the practice she did continue to make very specific requirements of S in terms of provision for individuals, the use of group work, and careful evaluation. In this process she tended to work with the student rather than as a trio with the teacher because the teacher had other concerns.

Tutor: "Well I think S's teacher - it sounds awful really - its very difficult but only being a supply teacher and she's only been there as long as S, but she does tend to work on quite a superficial level....that she's

always saying there are so many problems in this class and all that. In discussion we don't really get past that into what actually be done." However, the tutor maintained very good relationships with the teacher who was very helpful in supporting the student's implementation of the tutor's requests. In fact, the student now raised issues himself with the tutor (unlike in his previous period of passivity) and these were often issues previously discussed between teacher and student.

Comment

Relationships

This teaching practice was characterised by the trust developed between the participants. T and S worked throughout like partners but the tutor managed to retain their trust and respect even when she was making great demands of both and there was disagreement. She worked hard to retain this by thoroughly understanding the school situation and by going to a great deal of trouble to justify her actions.

S: "I found my tutor seemed to be quite hard.
It was not easy to keep up to her standard.
I found she worked me really hard."

but "Mine was giving loads of ideas, always
pushing me, which she's supposed to do but
always prepared to give her time."

The tutor's written comments on her summary sheet were:

"This practice has perhaps been a model of how I would want to approach teaching practice. The focus for me was the learning of the student as well as the children....What is essential, I believe, is to ensure from the outset that all three members of the teaching practice group (teacher, student, tutor) realise the need for equal input."

Student's strengths and weaknesses

By the end of the practice all the participants were well pleased with the student's performance. His relationship with the children and his control were always good but his developmental planning had been weak. Under the new system he worked hard with tutor and teacher to improve this. The tutor judged his most important characteristic to be his capacity to learn.

Tutor: "He has begun to recognise that he has the ability to initiate and provide ideas which are valid and useful. The passivity which was significant mid-practice has almost completely disappeared, whilst acknowledging that he has some way to go in terms of experience and application."

Help and support received by the student

The help which the student received has been described above. The significant aspect was the way in which the tutor and the teacher made different and complementary

inputs. The tutor understood the situation in the classroom well and systematically monitored and directed the student's efforts drawing his attention to planning, children's development, styles of teaching. Without this input the level of analysis would have been quite superficial. However, at a more spontaneous level the teacher contributed substantially to the implementation of all of this. The tutor referring to the teacher wrote: "A significant means of support to the student throughout the practice. She was always ready to give her opinion even when it was in disagreement (on the surface) with the tutor. I believe this teacher was aware of her role in "teaching" the student at an intuitive level and I would suggest that she has modified her ideas about what teaching practice is about i.e. that it is a learning experience for a student rather than a cut and dried assessment exercise. However I don't think she sees herself as an equal partner in the exercise yet although in practice she was. Her comments modified my approach and for this I was grateful."

Classification Collaborators

